School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1401317

EX LIBRIS
The Church Residence
South Pasadena, Calif.
DIOCESAN
LIBRARY

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/catholicfaithpra0000reva

R. Inwood. 08.

CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE

CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE

A MANUAL OF THEOLOGY

PART I.

BX
5930
M65
1905
pt.1

BY THE

REV. ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D.

Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia
Author of "Helps to Meditation," "The Seven Last Words of Our Most Holy Redeemer," etc., etc.

FIFTH EDITION

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
91 AND 93 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
LONDON AND BOMBAY
1905

Copyright, 1896, by
ALFRED G. MORTIMER

All Rights Reserved

First Edition, December, 1896
Reprinted April, 1897, and May, 1898
Fourth Edition Revised November, 1900
Fifth Edition, June, 1905

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

TO MY DEAR FRIEND

THE REV. HENRY R. PERCIVAL, D.D.,

RECTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE EVANGELISTS,

PHILADELPHIA,

IN MEMORY OF MANY DISCUSSIONS

OF KINDRED SUBJECTS,

I DEDICATE THIS VOLUME.

226128

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

I HAVE taken the opportunity afforded me by the demand for a fourth edition of *Catholic Faith and Practice*, Part I., to make a revision of the work.

In addition to the correction of clerical errors and changes made in obscure passages, I have rewritten parts of Chapter XVI., on "The Eucharist as a Sacrifice," substituting the definition of Dr. Paul Schanz for the definition of sacrifice before given, and altering some passages which referred to the destruction of the victim as a necessary element in sacrifice. I have also added an Appendix, in which is given a sketch of the various theories of the Eucharistic Sacrifice found in our own times.

The discussion of this question received a new stimulus from the prominence given to it in the controversy concerning Anglican Orders which led to the Papal Bull of 1896, but it had already borne fruit in the more liberal school represented in Germany by Scheeben and Schauz, and since then in France by Lepin.

The many inquiries made for books on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the entire absence of any modern works in English on the subject (other than Sadler's little book, *The One Offering*), suggested to me, three years ago, to prepare an Appendix to this volume in which might be gathered the principal authorities on the Eucharistic Sacrifice from Holy Scripture, the Liturgies, Fathers, mediæval and post-mediæval

writers, the Anglican Divines, etc. The work, however, grew into a book considerably larger than the volume to which it was intended to be an Appendix, and has therefore been published as a separate book under the title, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*.

The Appendix to this volume is simply a résumé of the present state of the question, together with a series of theological propositions in which are summed up what I believe to be the teachings of the Church with respect to the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

A. G. M.

S. Mark's Clergy House,
Philadelphia, Michaelmas, 1900.

PREFACE.

IN putting forth this volume of theological Instructions, I venture to crave indulgence for a somewhat full discussion of the needs which it is intended to meet, and of the circumstances which have emboldened me to attempt to meet them.

The main purpose of the book is to supply a Manual from which the clergy may draw matter for their Confirmation classes and other Instructions; and in which the laity may find a simple but full and accurate statement of the Church's teaching on all the chief points connected with the practical life of the Catholic.

It has been remarked that in the early days of the Catholic Revival the teaching of its great leaders was almost entirely dogmatic. Again and again in the pulpit, and in their writings, they went over the doctrines of the Church, thinking none too insignificant to be taught thoroughly. Nowadays it has rather become the practice to take it for granted that our people are well instructed in dogma, and therefore rarely to give any systematic doctrinal instruction.

This, however, is partly due to the fact that doctrinal sermons are supposed to be especially dry. They need not be so, for I have found the largest special congregations drawn together by courses of instruction on the dogmas of the Faith, and I have observed that such sermons especially attracted men.

With them constant appeals to the emotions soon lose their effect; whereas dogma, well and clearly explained, gives them something to think about, removes prejudice, creates interest, and often produces conviction.

I would suggest to my brethren of the Clergy who are perplexed by the question, "What shall I preach about?"—that the dogmatic theology of the Church will supply an inexhaustible theme.

In the United States there are five classes, with whom we are brought in contact in our work, who need such instruction:

(1) The children of Church people, whom it is our privilege to prepare for Confirmation and first Communion. Here, as a rule, we have little or no prejudice to overcome, but find docile souls eager to learn; and this great opportunity of imparting full and clear instruction, at least on the Sacraments, may never occur again. And yet it often happens that the opportunity is lost, or but partially improved.

(2) Then again, we have a constant stream of sectarians entering the Church; so that a large proportion of our Confirmation classes is made up of converts, often thoughtful people, willing and anxious to be thoroughly instructed in the Church's doctrines. Unfortunately, however, the men are almost invariably hindered by their business from attending a course of Confirmation instructions, and, therefore, have to depend largely on what is given them to read.

(3) Again, there is a large number of our own people who, though confirmed in youth, have had no definite theological instruction, and have not taken much interest in religion until by GOD'S Providence they have been brought in contact with Catholic teaching.

It often happens that these also can get a clear grasp of the Church's system of doctrine only by reading.

(4) And we are constantly discovering, even among our most devout communicants, very hazy and inaccurate opinions on subjects of the highest importance.

(5) Lastly, many of the younger Clergy (who do not all read Latin fluently) ask for a manual from which they can obtain matter for the instruction of their people; for the manuals used in most of our theological colleges (though I am glad to say, not in all) are so colourless as to be, in such cases, of no practical value.

Some may say, "But are there not many books written to supply such needs?" It is with great diffidence and extreme reluctance, and only because I find that all Catholic-minded priests of our Communion agree in this opinion, that I reply: Yes, there are many books, some quite orthodox and valuable, but not covering this ground. Many of them, however, are hopelessly inaccurate and often unintentionally heretical.

Some are well-meaning, but, from lack of theological knowledge, so incorrect as to be worse than useless. Others, while Catholic on many points, are spoiled by fads and pet heresies; as, for instance, probation after death, loose views of the Sacrament of Marriage and the rule of fasting Communion, Socialistic theories, etc., the propagation of which seems to be the main purpose of their publication. There are those again which, through the anxiety of their writers to disagree with Roman theology, teach Lutheran views of the Sacraments. But worst of all, there are some whose authors think themselves specially raised up to readjust the theology of the Church to the thought of the nineteenth century: which generally means the watering down of the

teachings of Christianity to suit the unbelief and immorality of the day.

I would not be thought to be unmindful that there are also excellent works, such as Staley's "Catholic Religion," which, however, while a most attractive and useful résumé of Church teaching, is (from the wide range of its subject) scarcely full enough in its treatment of the Sacraments to meet the need for which I write.

In "Catholic Faith and Practice" I have taken as the standard of doctrine, wherever possible, the teaching of the Catholic Church before the division of East and West; and in those subjects which had not then received full and definite treatment I have followed the consensus of the Eastern and Western Churches of the present day. And where these do not agree I have generally given both views, and briefly stated the reasons for the one which seems to be preferable. I have also endeavoured to avoid opinions which, though probably tenable, are comparatively modern, and lack Catholic consent.

As the book is not controversial there is no attempt to prove, but only to state, the doctrines of the Faith; and the opinions of heretics and schismatics have been ignored except where the statement of their unsound views seemed needful, either because widely held, or because the true view was thus set forth in a clearer light.

While quite recognizing that the teaching at once of everything in this book would be unwise in some parishes, I would point out the great difference between teaching *thoroughly* the doctrines which the people can receive, and waiting till they are able to accept full teaching on other subjects,—and the prac-

tice, so much to be deprecated, of *watering down* or explaining away unpopular doctrines. Such a course often arouses opposition, leads to accusations of dishonesty, and sometimes makes it extremely difficult afterwards to add the fuller teaching. Surely it is better to avoid such subjects until they can be taught quite thoroughly.

On page xli will be found a complete list of all works which have been consulted in the preparation of "Catholic Faith and Practice." They are arranged in two classes, A and B, the former (A) containing the general treatises on theology which have been used more or less throughout the book; the latter (B) composed of special works to which reference has been made only for the elucidation of points of history, liturgics, etc. I have not included in these lists books quoted at second-hand, where I have not been able to verify the quotations. The question of giving references in footnotes to the authorities consulted was carefully considered; but as these would often have taken up a quarter of the page, and thus greatly increased the size of the volume, and as in many cases some of the works (those which form Class A) would have appeared on almost every page, the references have been omitted.

As the book is intended for so many classes of readers, it has been written in a style more free than generally belongs to dogmatic theology, but (it is hoped) without sacrifice of accuracy or fulness of treatment.

To facilitate the use of the book by the Clergy for Instructions and Addresses, a full marginal analysis has been supplied, from which, with some amplifications, a table of contents has been made up; so that by reference to the analyses each chapter will be found to contain matter for several addresses.

If it should seem to some that I have devoted to the Holy Eucharist a disproportionate space—one quarter of the whole book—I would remind them that our Eucharists, whether as Communions or acts of worship, are the very centre of our spiritual life as Catholics; so that it is of supreme importance that we should have a thorough understanding of the doctrine of the Church in regard to this great Sacrament; and further I venture to observe that where this is the case and the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is fully grasped, people seldom find any difficulty in accepting in their fulness the other dogmas of the Catholic Faith.

My work has no claim to originality; in many cases it is little more than a translation from Latin, Greek, and French theological works. In the chapter on the Atonement I would acknowledge my indebtedness to an essay by the Hon. and Rev. Arthur Lyttleton. Of other books which I have freely used (as I have already said), a complete list will be found on page xli.

This volume is complete in itself (and indeed contains all that was originally contemplated), comprising, as it does, all that is needed for the intelligent use of the principal Sacraments. But should it meet with favour I hope to be able to bring out a second Part, treating of such subjects as have been omitted here. This will make the two volumes a fairly complete Manual of Theology. On page xxxix will be found a sketch of the subjects which it is proposed to discuss in Vol. II.

My most hearty thanks are due to my friends, the Rev. H. R. Percival, D.D., and the Rev. Thomas Bingham, M.A., for reading the manuscript, and for many valuable suggestions and corrections; to the latter also for correcting the proof-sheets; to them the book and its author owe much.

In treating of so many subjects where extreme accuracy is required, it is quite probable that through inadvertence errors may have been overlooked. I can only say that I shall be very grateful to have any such pointed out, and that all I have written is submitted unreservedly to the judgment of the Church.

ALFRED G. MORTIMER.

S. MARK'S CLERGY HOUSE,
PHILADELPHIA, ALL SAINTS, 1896.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

GOD.

PAGE

Introductory: "Quid est Deus?"—Practical value of accurate knowledge of GOD in times of trial.—And as a basis for prayer 1

I. GOD'S NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES 3

1. Metaphysical Essence 4
2. Incommunicable Attributes: i. Infinity; ii. Unity; iii. Simplicity; iv. Immutability; v. Eternity; vi. Immensity; vii. Omnipresence 6
3. Communicable Attributes: i. Spirit; ii. Life; iii. Knowledge; iv. Will: (1) Peter Lombard's View, (2) S. John Damascene's View; v. Moral Qualities: (1) Wisdom, (2) Holiness, (3) Justice, (4) Truth, (5) Goodness, (6) Happiness; vi. Power: (1) Absolute, (2) Ordinary; vii. Love 11
4. GOD'S Attributes necessary, not arbitrary.—Manifested in His Providence . . . 11

II. THE HOLY TRINITY: Definition 12

1. One Essence 13
2. Two Processions: i. Procession of the SON—Eternal Generation; ii. Procession of the HOLY SPIRIT—One Spiration . . . 14
3. Three Persons 15
4. Four Relations 16
5. Five Notions 16
6. Perichoresis 17
7. Errors of Sabellianism and Tritheism . . 17

PAGE

8. The Five Views of GOD: i. Pantheism; ii. Polytheism; iii. Dualism; iv. Monotheism without personal differentiation; v. Christianity 18

CHAPTER II.

THE CREATION AND FALL OF THE ANGELS.

Introductory: Creation the overflow of GOD'S love.—Theological meaning of the term "Creation."—Three creative acts in Gen. i.—GOD'S use of means.—Creative acts probably few.—Creation instantaneous.—Conservation.—The world created in time.—Gen. i. divided into two parts: 1. A Creation; 2. A Restoration after a Catastrophe.—No authoritative theory of the Six Days.—The end or purpose of creation.—Motive of creation, GOD'S free will and love.—All Three Persons co-operated in creation.—Creation of things spiritual and material 21

I. THE ANGELS: Definition.—Have they bodies?—Angelic knowledge intuitive 25

II. THE NUMBER AND FUNCTIONS OF THE ANGELS: The Nine Choirs.—The Functions of the different Choirs: 26

1. First Hierarchy: i. Seraphim; ii. Cherubim; iii. Thrones 27

2. Second Hierarchy: iv. Dominions; v. Principalities; vi. Powers 28

3. Third Hierarchy: vii. Virtues; viii. Archangels; ix. Angels 28

Through Angels GOD works mediately.—Guardian Angels.—In what state were the Angels created? . 29

III. THEIR TRIAL: In what it consisted.—Three Views: that Lucifer desired 30

1. To be like GOD 30

2. To be a Sovereign 30

3. To be the Instrument of the Incarnation . 31

The result of the sin of the Angels.—Holy Angels admitted to the Vision of GOD.—Could the fallen Angels repent?—Some from each order fell.—Men created to fill their places 31

CHAPTER III.

THE CREATION AND FALL OF MAN.

PAGE

Introductory: Man created to fill the places of the fallen Angels, whose malice had wrecked the primeval earth. —Its Restoration 33

I. HUMAN NATURE AS CREATED BY GOD: In GOD'S Image.—Dichotomy and Trichotomy.—The soul of man.—The soul immortal.—Three ways in which a being may be immortal.—Man not only rational but religious.—Origin of the soul: 33

1. Traducianism 36
2. Generationism 36
3. Creationism 36

Man whether created in a state of nature or grace.—Man in the supernatural state 36

II. ADAM'S TRIAL: Adam's knowledge.—The Tempter appealed to the passion of curiosity by 36

1. A doubt about a truth of Revelation . . 37
2. The denial of a truth of Revelation . . 37
3. Removing the fear of consequences of sin . 37
4. Promising a great reward 37

Adam's temptation a type of all temptation.—Temptation analyzed.—Adam restricted only by intellectual discipline.—The temptations appealed to the intellect, as S. Bernard shows.—Three steps in the temptation.—Undisciplined desire of the intellect the chief temptation even now 38

III. THE CONSEQUENCES OF ADAM'S SIN: Total depravity an exaggeration on the one side, as Pelagianism is on the other.—The chief result was discord in man's nature. —Before the fall man possessed 39

1. Sanctifying Grace 40
2. Præternatural Gifts 40

[Explanation of terms used: Natural.—Præternatural. —Supernatural. — Concupiscence. — First Motions.— The moral struggle.—Not two wills conflicting, but the will and first motions.—Struggle traced to opposite causes.—Integrity.—Concupiscence not sin.]— What man lost by the Fall 43

PAGE

1. All supernatural grace 43
2. And præternatural gifts 43

Original sin a privation of gifts, and a tendency to evil from the loss of "integrity."—Image of GOD not lost.

IV. TWO CHIEF ERRORS IN REGARD TO THE FALL. . . 43
1. Pelagianism 43
2. Lutheranism 44

Catholic View.—Science blind to a Fall.—Yet the only explanation of moral struggle.—Heredity explains original sin.—Drunkenness and kindred habits scientifically demand a "Fall" 45

CHAPTER IV.

THE INCARNATION.

Introductory: The Incarnation the keystone of Christianity, yet often but imperfectly understood.—The Revelation of GOD,—and of man.—The Incarnation reveals the end and purpose of man's creation.—Article II. . . 47

I. WHY DID THE INCARNATION TAKE PLACE? Thomist View,—Scotist View.—Scotist View examined.—All things created for a perfect end.—A law of progress.—Four epochs of this progress in our planet . . . 47
1. Development of inorganic matter . . . 48
2. Of organic life 48
3. Of moral life 48
4. Of Divine life 48

Creation the act of GOD'S Antecedent Will.—The material world found its climax in man,—and by the Incarnation was to be taken with man into GOD,—without suffering and death.—Geology a record of progress.—Two catastrophes which led to a modification of the original plan.—Sin: its meaning,—and result.—The remedy for the Fall provided by GOD'S Consequent Will.—Man a moral being.—The two trees in Eden—Evil as a possibility necessary to a moral choice.—Collapse of man's nature at the Fall.—After the Fall a new preparation for the Incarnation,—in Judaism,—and everywhere.—Eastern mystics, Chaldean and Egyptian sages, Greeks and Romans, all

PAGE

helped to prepare for CHRIST.—Roman roads.—Parallelisms with Christianity.—Instead of the last step in the Gospel of Creation the Incarnation became the first in the Gospel of Redemption.—By it was restored what had been lost by the Fall 54

II. THE INCARNATION AS A FACT: Definition.—The means: The Virgin Birth.—Human nature and human personality.—Why the Word took impersonal human nature.—Four heresies in regard to the Incarnation refuted by Councils 54

1. Arianism, by Nicæa 56
2. Apollinarianism, by Constantinople . . 56
3. Nestorianism, by Ephesus 56
4. Eutychianism, by Chalcedon 57

The Catholic doctrine.—The HOLY GHOST the Agent in the Incarnation.—CHRIST the Son of Mary.—His Human Soul.—CHRIST the SON of GOD.—No Human Personality 58

III. CONSEQUENCES OF HUMAN NATURE BEING ASSUMED BY GOD 58

1. The actions of CHRIST: i. Acts of the Divine Nature; ii. Acts of the Human Nature; iii. Theandric Acts.—Definition of S. John Damascene 58
2. The Liberty of CHRIST 60
3. The Hypostatic Union permanent: The Dereliction 60
4. The Knowledge of CHRIST: His Economic Ignorance 61
5. Communicatio Idiomatum: Illustrated from S. Proclus 62

CHAPTER V.

THE ATONEMENT.

Introductory: The Atonement in its relation to the Incarnation.—Complexity in the idea of the Atonement.—Little help from authorized definitions.—Holy Scripture our chief guide.—Ideas sometimes paradoxical

PAGE

because fragmentary.—The various truths which make up the doctrine to be stated 65

I. THREE PRELIMINARY FACTS MUST FIRST BE CONSIDERED . 67

1. Twofold conception of the fact of sin : i. A sense of alienation from GOD ; ii. A conviction of guilt. [Note on the difficulty in the phrase "the wrath of GOD."] 68

2. The universal existence of the idea of Sacrifice : i. Twofold idea involved in Sacrifice : (1) Love the essential idea, (2) Sin and penitence a secondary element ; ii. Twofold conception of the effects of Sacrifice : (1) As reconciling man with GOD, (2) As removing guilt and its punishment

3. GOD'S Attributes of Mercy and Truth in relation to sin : i. Set forth in Holy Scripture ; ii. And found outside Holy Scripture ; iii. These two views of GOD set forth by (1) Stoics and Epicureans, (2) Pharisees and Sadducees, (3) Calvinists and Universalists ; iv. The Cross of CHRIST the reconciliation of the paradox. [Illustrated by the story of Zaleucus] . .

II. THE ELEMENTS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT . 74

1. Propitiation : i. Obedience gave the Death of CHRIST its propitiatory value ; ii. Expiation for the past another element in propitiation ; iii. Death and victory over death essential to propitiation 75

2. Vicarious suffering : i. The willingness of the sufferer ; ii. The principle of vicarious suffering found in human experience ; iii. The representative character of the Victim . . 78

3. Reconciliation of GOD and man : i. By deliverance from sin ; ii. By the gift of Divine life ; iii. By the imparted righteousness of CHRIST.

III. CONCLUDING REMARKS : Three stages in the work of Redemption 80

1. Deliverance from sin 80

2. The gift of life 80

3. The gift of union with GOD 80

PAGE

The Atonement includes the Resurrection and Ascension of CHRIST, by which He becomes our Mediator and Great High Priest.—Importance of grasping all the elements which make up this doctrine.—The merits of the Atonement of no avail unless appropriated by the individual through faith.—This faith not only objective but subjective.—The Sacrifice of CHRIST offered to the Holy Trinity, but especially to GOD the FATHER.—It includes all good works wrought in CHRIST.—Among its benefits are 83

1. The Sacraments 83

2. His Merits, the treasure of the Church . . 83

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH.

Introductory: The formation of the Church . . . 84

I. DEFINITION OF CHURCH 85

1. Three divisions of the Church: i. Triumphant; ii. Expectant; iii. Militant 85

2. Three titles of the Church: i. The Bride of CHRIST; ii. The Body of CHRIST; iii. The Kingdom of Heaven 85

Apostolic Succession.—The sectarian ministry.—The ministry of the Church 86

II. THE FOUR PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS OF THE CHURCH: . 87

1. The Church as the teacher of absolute truth . 88

Scriptural authority.—Man's thirst for truth and freedom.—Spheres of truth: i. Scientific truth; ii. Metaphysical truth—leads to theology.—Belief in GOD'S existence leads to belief in Revelation.—The rival claims of philosophy as a teacher.—The confession of philosophers.—The Church's sphere of truth: i. Necessary truth; ii. Speculative truth.—The method of the Church's teaching: i. Creeds; ii. General Councils; iii. Consensus of theologians and of the faithful.—Rule of S. Vincent of Lerins.—Sectarian teaching tested by it.

PAGE

2. The Church as the guide in morals . . . 94
History of ethics.—Confession of moralists.—The Church's code of morals: i. Matter; ii. Form.—Scientific moralists differ concerning: i. The basis of morals; ii. The standard of morals; iii. The necessity of morals.—i. The Church's basis; ii. The Church's standard; iii. The Church's theory of necessity.—The basis of the Church's code.—Sphere of morals: i. Precepts; ii. Counsels.—The Church's code tested by the rule of S. Vincent.—Two objections: i. Conscience as the only guide; ii. Civil Law as the sufficient guide.

3. The Church as the dispenser of grace . . 99

4. The Church as the director of worship . . 100
Importance of a law of worship.—A fallacious theory refuted positively: i. by the example of Korah; ii. of Uzzah.—The theory refuted negatively by our LORD.—The Church's ritual symbolical 102

CHAPTER VII.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH'S DOCTRINE.

Introductory: Three witnesses to the Church's doctrine . 103

I. TRADITION 103
Definition.—Illustration of Tradition from man's physical nature.—Tradition and the Unction of the HOLY GHOST.—Two results of this . . . 105

1. The Church's doctrines are infallible . . 105

2. and Unchangeable 105
Analogy of a tree.—The Church's doctrines tested.—The same doctrines among heretics 106

II. HOLY SCRIPTURE 106
Not the first *fons*.—The Protestant view of the Bible false in fact.—Holy Scripture first a witness to the Church's doctrine.—Afterwards a *fons*.—From the Council of Carthage, Scripture a source of the Church's doctrine.—Result of the Protestant view of the Bible .

III. HUMAN REASON 109
The relation of Reason and Revelation . . . 109

PAGE

On examination 109
1. Revelation commends itself to reason . . . 110
2. Offers a solution of many problems . . . 110
3. And satisfies man's cravings 110
The answer to "What is truth?"—What the teachings of the Church are.—Whither seekers after truth are led.—Does the Church's teaching satisfy?—The Catholic Faith the revelation of CHRIST 110
1. Perpetuated by Tradition 112
2. Witnessed to by Holy Scripture 113
3. Accepted by Human Reason 113
Conclusion: A threefold cord not easily broken . . . 113

CHAPTER VIII.

GRACE AND THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

Introductory: The Church the dispenser of grace.—Judaism taught truth and morals.—Christianity distinguished from all other religions by its claim to dispense "grace."—Grace the fruit of the Incarnation and Atonement.—Grace the preparation for glory.—The difference between the natural and supernatural man is "grace."—In Christian life grace permeates every action.—The order of grace.—Greatness of the subject . . . 114
I. GRACE: Its Definition 116
1. 1. In worldly usage; 2. Theologically: (1) In the most general sense; (2) In a restricted sense; (3) In the strict sense 116
2. Its Divisions: i. Grace of the "first State" and of the "second State," or the grace of GOD and the grace of CHRIST. ii. Gratia gratis data and gratum faciens. iii. Uncreated and Created grace. iv. External and Internal grace. v. Habitual and Actual grace. vi. the "first Grace" and the "second Grace." vii. Divisions of Actual grace: (1) Illumination and Inspiration; (2) Grace of the

PAGE

Intellect and Will ; (3) Medicinal and Elevating grace ; (4) Exciting, Operating or Prevailing, and Assisting, Co-operating or Accompanying grace. viii. Sufficient and Efficient grace . 117

II. The Sacraments the chief means of grace . . 120

1. Definition, etc. of Sacrament.—History of "Sacrament."—Mystery as its equivalent.—Wider use of "Sacrament" until the twelfth century.—Sacraments channels of grace.—They confer grace "ex opere operato," and not "ex opere operantis."—Sacraments typified in Mosaic Law.—Their number limited to seven.—GOD is their Author ;—the Church only their dispenser 121

2. The essentials of a Sacrament : i. Matter ; ii. Form ; iii. The Minister—the intention of the Minister ; iv. The Subject ; v. Dispositions . 123

3. Classification of Sacraments : i. Of the living and of the dead ; ii. Those which impress character and those which do not ; iii. Those which are *generally* necessary, and those which are not *generally* necessary 125

4. Sacramentals 128

Sanctifying grace,—Sacramental grace . . . 129

CHAPTER IX.

BAPTISM.

Introductory : The consequences of the Fall.—Their remedy.—Affecting human nature,—and applied to individuals

I. Baptism 130

The teaching of ancient theologians.—Three modes of Baptism 131

1. Baptism of water 131

2. Of blood 131

3. Of desire : Explicitly illustrated by the case of Valentinian II.—Implicit desire discussed.—Case of Infants ;—of Adults ;—of Quakers 131

PAGE

Difference between man in a state of nature and of grace.—State of nature.—State of grace.—The teaching of CHRIST.—Statement by S. Paul.—Objection of Nicodemus.—Man's possibilities in a state of nature.—Case of an unbaptized adult.—Unbaptized infants.—Opinion of S. Thomas.—Case of S. John Baptist . 133

II. The Sacrament of Baptism: Its Institution . . 137

1. Matter 138

2. Form 139

3. Minister: A Priest the ordinary minister.—A layman sufficient.—Schismatical and heretical Baptism valid 139

4. Subject 140

III. The effects of Baptism 140

1. Regeneration 140

2. Remission of sin 140

3. Infusion of grace 141

4. Character . . . . . .

Light, life, and union conferred in Baptism . . 141

IV. Dispositions: For valid Baptism, consent alone necessary.—For the benefits, faith and penitence required in an adult.—No dispositions required in an infant . . 142

Conclusion 143

CHAPTER X.

CONFIRMATION.

Introductory: Titles of the Sacrament. 144

I. Confirmation.—Instituted by CHRIST 144

1. Matter: Four opinions: i. Imposition of hands; ii. Chrism; iii. Twofold matter; iv. Chrismation, that is, imposition of hands together with anointing 145

2. Form: i. Roman form; ii. Eastern form; iii. Anglican form 146

3. Minister 146

4. Subject 147

PAGE

5. Dispositions 147
6. Effects: i. Character; ii. Special gift of the HOLY GHOST 147

II. The Gifts of the HOLY GHOST 148
1. Foretold by Isaiah: i. The endowment of CHRIST; ii. of the Church; iii. of the Christian 148
2. The virtues of man: i. Natural or cardinal virtues; ii. Theological virtues; iii. The action of the Seven Gifts 149
3. Effects of One HOLY SPIRIT: Four gifts intellectual.—Three moral.—The relation of the gifts to the theological virtues . . . 150

III. The Seven Gifts in their several effects . . 151
1. Holy Fear 151
2. Piety 151
3. Ghostly Strength (Might) 152
4. Knowledge: i. of creatures; ii. of their true end; iii. guides us in our life and work . . 153
5. Counsel 154
6. Understanding: Gives a knowledge of GOD: i. in His Perfections; ii. Ways; iii. Word; iv. Religion; v. Providence 154
7. Wisdom: i. Gives Sweetness; ii. Intuition . 155
All Seven Gifts potentially received 156

IV. Their special operations produce certain classes in the Church 156
1. Holy Fear, the Saints 156
2. Piety, Builders of Churches, etc. . . . 156
3. Ghostly Strength, the Martyrs 157
4. Knowledge, the Apologists 157
5. Counsel, the Moral Theologians . . . 157
6. Understanding, the Dogmatic Theologians . 157
7. Wisdom, the Ascetic Theologians . . . 157

V. The Gifts develop a Christlike Life,—as revealed in the Beatitudes,—and are the remedy for the Deadly Sins.—They produce the Fruits of the SPIRIT . . 157
1. In our life towards GOD 158
2. Towards our neighbour 158

PAGE

3. Towards ourselves 158
The weapons of the Christian.—The ceremony of Knighthood 158
Conclusion 159

CHAPTER XI.

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

Introductory: A Sacrament needed for post-Baptismal sin.—Mortal sin destroys grace.—Institution of this Sacrament.—Penance as a virtue.—As a Sacrament.—A safeguard against self-deceit regarding one's spiritual state, 160
I. THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE 162
1. Matter: i. The Proximate matter. ii. Remote matter: (1) Necessary; (2) Voluntary . . 162
2. Form 163
3. Minister 164
4. Subject 164
5. Dispositions: Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction.—Attrition 164
6. Effects: It conveys "first grace,"—Grace of the Sacrament,—Sanctifying grace or Charity.—Restoration of Merits.—Definition of Merits.—In mortal sin we cannot merit.—Dead works.—Infused virtues revived.—Mortal sin involves guilt and punishment . . . 165
II. FORMS OF ABSOLUTION 167
1. Declaratory at Matins and Evensong . . 167
2. Precatory in the Liturgy.—Rubric preceding it.—The Long Exhortation.—Pardon of venial sin. 167
3. Judicial in the Sacrament of Penance.—Precatory form sufficient.—A Sacrament can only be administered to a subject.—Teaching of the Exhortation.—Confession not compulsory.—The equivalent of the Sacrament . . . 169
III. HISTORY OF ABSOLUTIONS IN THE LITURGY . . . 171
Conclusion 172

CHAPTER XII.

SIN AND SELF-EXAMINATION.

PAGE

Introductory: The question of salvation.—Necessity of self-examination, and some instruction on sin . . . 173

I. SIN: Its nature and malice.—Definition.—Malice of sin—against GOD the FATHER—the SON—and the HOLY GHOST 175

II. DIVISIONS OF SIN 175

1. Actual and Habitual: i. Actual sin; ii. Habitual sin 175

2. Formal and Material: i. Formal sin; ii. Material sin 176

3. Mortal and Venial: i. Mortal sin: Its characteristics: (1) Weighty Matter, (2) Consciousness of guilt, (3) Consent of the will; ii. Venial sin remitted through prayer.—Evils of venial sin: (1) Diminution of fervour, (2) Hindrance to sanctifying grace, (3) Preparation of the soul for mortal sin, (4) Diversion of the will, (5) Grieving the HOLY GHOST . . . 177

4. Omission and Commission: i. Sins of commission; ii. Sins of omission: (1) Their number and extent, (2) Their greatness in GOD'S sight 181

5. Sins of thought, word, and deed: i. Sins of thought.—When evil thoughts become sins. ii. Sins of word. iii. Sins of deed . . 182

III. SELF-EXAMINATION 183

1. Four difficulties: i. Familiarity with sin; ii. False views of sin; iii. Self-deception; iv. The deceits of the devil 183

2. The remedy the help of the HOLY GHOST.—Parable of the lost piece of silver . . . 185

3. Method of self-examination: i. Divisions of life; ii. Questions on the Commandments and Deadly Sins; iii. Result to be written; iv. Prayer for aid 185

CHAPTER XIII.

CONDITIONS REQUIRED FOR PENITENCE.

PAGE

Introductory: The three conditions 187

I. CONTRITION 187

1. Definition.—i. Attrition; ii. Its relation to Contrition 187

2. Signs of Contrition: Fruits demanded: i. Readiness to confess; ii. Readiness to amend; iii. Readiness to avoid temptation; iv. Readiness to forgive; Readiness to make satisfaction . 189

3. How to get Contrition 191

II. CONFESSION 191

1. Definition.—Frequent unreality of confession to GOD alone.—Form of Confiteor addressed to GOD.—Confession in the Bible.—All people believe in Confession to man 191

2. Benefits of Confession to a man: i. Sympathy; ii. Self-Knowledge; iii. Humility; iv. Help to contrition; v. Counsel 192

3. Reasons for making confession to a Priest: i. He is trained to give counsel—others are not; ii. A Priest represents the Church; iii. The Sacramental Seal; iv. Absolution . . . 194

4. How to make a good confession: (1) With sorrow; (2) With faith; (3) With sincerity; (4) With purpose of amendment; (5) With hope of pardon 195

5. Practical hints 196

III. SATISFACTION 196

1. Definition.—The Satisfaction of CHRIST—applied in Baptism—and in Penance.—GOD inflicts temporal punishment for pardoned sin:—The Israelites—David—Nebuchadnezzar.—The sense in which "satisfaction" is used of man.—Two effects of mortal sin: i. Guilt; ii. Punishment.—Penance imposed by the Priest. 197

2. Elements of Satisfaction: i. Amendment; ii.

PAGE

Restitution; iii. Penance; iv. Reparation: (1) Works of Mercy, (2) Special offerings, (3) Zeal for souls, (4) Hatred of sin . . . 200

Conclusion 201

CHAPTER XIV.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.—AS A SACRAMENT.

Introductory 202

I. DEFINITION, ETC.—Titles.—Excellences.—Types.—Institution.—The Agent.—Our Lord both Victim and Priest.—A third division in this Sacrament . . . 202

II. THE ESSENTIALS OF THE SACRAMENT 205

1. Matter: Bread.—Wine.—Mixed Chalice . . 205

2. Form: Western view; Eastern view.—Eastern view examined: i. It is incorrect as appears (1) From Bessarion's testimony; (2) From the general action of prayer; (3) From the position of the Oblation. ii. It lacks antiquity.—Council of Florence,—John Maro,—Georgius Coresius,—Speech of Bessarion,—S. Chrysostom quoted.—Western view therefore correct . 206

3. Minister 211

4. Subject 211

III. THE EFFECTS OF THE SACRAMENT 211

1. On the soul: i. Perfection and Conservation; ii. Strength and closer union; iii. Remission of sin 212

2. On the body 213

CHAPTER XV.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.—THE REAL PRESENCE.

Introductory 214

I. NATURE OF THE PRESENCE.—Proofs 214

1. From our Lord's words.—Protestant objec-

PAGE

tions: And their answers. i. They were not figurative; ii. They were spiritual, but absolutely true.—Analogy of CHRIST'S words to the woman of Samaria.—Gross views guarded against 214

2. The witness of the Church 219

II. FOUR ERRONEOUS VIEWS 220

1. Zwinglianism 220

2. Transubstantiation inaccurately taught . . 220

3. Consubstantiation and Lutheranism . . . 221

4. Calvinism and the Receptionist theory . . 221

The four views summed up 221

III. POSITIVE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH: Nature of the Presence.—Concomitance.—Mode inexplicable; not natural or material, but supernatural, spiritual, supra-local and sacramental.—Reception under one kind.—What is man's body?—The body of a whirlwind.—Matter not necessary to a glorified body—but possible.—Example of angels—with Tobit—with Abraham.—Our Lord after His Resurrection 222

IV. MODE OF THE PRESENCE: Tridentine definition.—Substance an equivocal term;—a philosophical theory only.—Substance as defined by S. Thomas.—Transubstantiation accepted by the Eastern Church.—Article XXVIII. does not refer to Tridentine definition, 1. Since it was written before the definition, 2. Which does not overthrow the nature of a Sacrament. Capernaite view.—Opinions of Romans as to the accidents:—Algerus quoted.—Transubstantiation a metaphysical theory 225

V. EUCHARISTIC ADORATION A DUTY—from the fact of the Hypostatic Union.—For believers to neglect it is inconsistent.—Adoration an expression of love.—Reservation for the sick the practice of the early Church.—The American Pastoral of 1895.—The Rubric examined . 229

1. Does not refer to Reservation 231

2. Does not forbid it 232

Article XXVIII. 232

Conclusion 233

CHAPTER XVI.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.—THE SACRIFICE.

PAGE

Introductory: History of the idea of Sacrifice—among the Heathen,—among the Jews.—Sacrificial idea developed—by Law, Ritual, Type and Prophecy.—Our Lord's Sacrificial Work in its details prefigured.—All Sacrifices of the old world point onward to the Cross.—The Eucharistic Sacrifice perpetuates the Cross . . . 234

I. DEFINITION OF SACRIFICE.—Definition examined.—Immaterial offerings not properly sacrifices.—Is destruction of the victim essential to sacrifice? 236

II. THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE 237

1. In what it consists: The Eucharistic Sacrifice compared with the definition.—Four Sacrificial Actions in the Eucharist: (1) Consecration; (2) Oblation; (3) Fraction; (4) Communion. The essential act in the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—Other views.—Two explanations: (1) The Eucharistic Sacrifice the application of the Work of Redemption; (2) Our Lord's Living Body in the Eucharist 237

2. Its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross: The Eucharistic Sacrifice not a repetition of Calvary,—but mystically identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross.—The identity is found in the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice: the same Body, the same Blood, the same Priest, the same Victim.—Differences in mode between the two:—the Presence Visible and Mystical,—the Priest Immediate and Mediate,—the Sacrifice Bloody and Unbloody,—General and Individual,—the Human Race and the Church.—The Sacrifice of the Cross contained the merits of all Eucharists.—The Eucharist a relative Sacrifice 240

3. Its relation to our Lord's Mediation: The Oblation in Heaven.—The peculiarity of the Sacrifice of the Day of Atonement . . . 242

PAGE

III. In what way it is offered by the Faithful: They assist in the offering of the Priest. 243

1. Three fruits of the Sacrifice: i. The general fruit; ii. The special fruit; ii. The most special fruit 244

2. Four ends of Sacrifice: i. Praise. ii. Thanksgiving.—Neglect of thanksgiving the great obstacle to spiritual progress.—The ingratitude of coming only to communicate. iii. Propitiation. iv. Impetration 244

IV. Some general considerations: The merits of the two Sacrifices not the same.—The grace works "ex opere operato,"—but in impetration also "ex opere operantis."—Cases of interrupted Masses,—private Masses.—Solitary Masses forbidden. 247

CHAPTER XVII.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.—THE COMMUNION.

Introductory: GOD'S gift and conservation of life.—In the work of conservation GOD uses means.—The law of food,—in the preservation of physical life,—of mental life,—of spiritual life.—The Holy Eucharist the key to many mysteries.—Its relation to the lower creation through the law of food.—This law does not stop at man.—In the Holy Communion no real reversal of this law.—The Eucharist is to the moral world what the sun is to the material, its Centre 249

I. The chief effects of Communion 252

1. Special: (1) Perfection and Conservation; (2) Closer Union with CHRIST; (3) Remission of sin; (4) Restoration of a certain "Integrity" 252

2. General: The Communion acts upon: i. The affections; ii. The intellect; iii. The will; iv. It affects also the body.—Effects peculiar to each species 252

PAGE

II. THE TWELVE FRUITS OF COMMUNION ACCORDING TO S. THOMAS 253

1. First four fruits: i. It drives away the devil; ii. Cools the heat of desire; iii. Cleanses the stain of the heart; iv. Appeases the anger of GOD 253

2. Second four fruits: i. Illumination of the intellect; ii. Kindling of the affections; iii. Remedy against lack of perseverance; iv. Strength for our work 254

3. Last four fruits: i. Freedom from eternal death; ii. Increase of merit; iii. Consolation and guidance in our exile; iv. The pledge and means of resurrection to eternal life . . 256

III. DISPOSITIONS AND PREPARATION 257

1. Preparation of the Soul: i. The dignity of the Holy Sacrament demands: (1) Faith; (2) Purity; (a) The cleansing of the soul, (b) Works of penance, (c) Kindling of charity; (3) Prayer. ii. Lessons taught by the bread used: [(1) Contrition; (2) Confession; (3) Charity.] iii. Lessons from the Paschal lamb: (1) From the Lamb itself; (2) From the three ceremonies at the Feast; (3) From the equipment of the eaters.—Summary of preparation of the soul . 258

2. Preparation of the Body: Fasting Communion the absolute law of the Catholic Church.—S. Augustine's witness to this law. — Other Fathers. — Report of the committee of the English House of Bishops in 1894.—Their extraordinary conclusion. — Fallacy of their argument from Article XXXIV.: i. Not "only by man's authority," if S. Augustine is correct in his judgment; ii. The law never changed or abrogated by any act of the Church of England; iii. Such action quite "ultra vires"; iv. To its neglect may be traced irreverence and loss of faith.—The Viaticum the only exception to this rule . . . 262

PAGE

IV. THREE METHODS OF EATING 266
1. Sacramentally only 266
2. Spiritually only 266
3. Sacramentally and spiritually 267
Thanksgiving.—Frequency of Communion . . . 268
Conclusion 268

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE LITURGY.

Introductory: York Minster 269
I. THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH TO MANY A HIDDEN TREASURE.—Carries us back to the first Maundy Thursday.—Bp. Lightfoot's introduction to S. Clement's epistle to the Corinthians—points out traces of liturgical prayers.—His three questions.—Traces of a form of liturgy in S. Paul's writings, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews.—The Apostolic Liturgy—at first unwritten but committed to memory—on account of the "disciplina arcani."—No service-books surrendered by the traditores.—Written liturgies date from the time of Constantine.—The Apostolic Constitutions.—Five families of liturgies: S. James (or Jerusalem), S. Mark (or Alexandria), S. John and S. Paul (or Ephesus), S. Peter or S. Clement (or Rome), S. Thaddæus, or Adæus, and Maris (or Edessa). Probably all descended from the Apostolic Liturgy.—Sameness of structure in all.—The Liturgy of the British Church probably Ephesian like the Gallican.—The Liturgy of our Church Petrine or Roman 270
II. LITURGIES DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS, ANAPHORA AND PRO-ANAPHORA.—The term Mass.—Its derivation.—Used by S. Ambrose, A.D. 385,—and in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.—Ordinary and Canon . . . 272
1. Ordinary: i. Introduction; ii. Offertory; . 274
2. Canon: i. Consecration; ii. Communion; iii. Post-Communion 274

PAGE

III. The Ritual of the Liturgy : Source of the Mosaic ritual ;—of the Church's ritual.—It carries us forward to Heaven—and backward to Cavalry.—The symbolism of Church architecture.—The Nave,—the Chancel,—the Choir,—the Altar,—the Cross,—the Candles,—the Altar Cloths,—the Five Colours.—Vestments of the Priest 274
1. The Cassock and Cincture 278
2. The Amice 278
3. The Alb 278
4. The Girdle 278
5. The Stole 278
6. The Maniple 278
7. The Chasuble 279
Incense.—Genuflection.—The Sign of the Cross . . 279

IV. The different parts of the Service may be taken to remind us of the principal acts of our LORD'S Life : Introit, — Our FATHER, — Commandments and Kyries,—Epistle,—Gospel,—Creed,—Offertory,—Bread and Wine,—Alms,—Exhortation,—Confession, Comfortable Words,—Sanctus,—Prayer of Humble Access,—Consecration,—Fracture of the Host,—Elevation,—Communion of the People,—Covering of the Chalice,—Gloria in Excelsis,—Benediction . . 281

V. Hints to Communicants 283

Conclusion 284

CHAPTER XIX.

PRAYER.

Introductory : Analogy between the body and soul of man.—Prayer the atmosphere of the soul's life.—Spiritual malaria 285

I. The nature of prayer : Definition.—Three constituents of prayer 286
1. The Suppliant : i. He must be rational and possess free-will ; ii. He must be dependent . 286
2. One to Whom prayer is made ; Who is Omniscient and Omnipotent 287

PAGE

3. The act of prayer itself.—Prayer the exercise of hope.—Its foundation faith.—Its result love . 287
II. THE PURPOSE OF PRAYER: To fulfil the Will of GOD.—Two results of prayer 288
1. The objective result,—depends on co-operation with GOD.—Prayer the motive power of the spiritual life 289
2. The subjective result,—the conforming of our will to GOD'S Will.—The lesson of Gethsemane 290
III. THE CONDITIONS OF PRAYER 291
1. The matter: Those things which are for our good.—Those things which are not for our good.—Those temporal blessings about which we are uncertain 291
2. The suppliant, [who must be in a state of grace or desiring to repent] 292
3. The manner: i. Faith; ii. Hope; iii. Humility; iv. Perseverance 292
IV. THE JOY OF PRAYER 294
1. Gethsemane 294
2. Tabor 295
V. THE STRUCTURE OF PRAYER 295
1. The Invocation 296
2. The Petition 297
3. The Plea 297
VI. THE KINDS OF PRAYER 297
1. Vocal prayer 297
2. Mental prayer 298
VII. DISTRACTIONS IN PRAYER 298
Conclusion 299

CHAPTER XX.

THE RULE OF LIFE.

Introductory: S. Bernard preaching the Second Crusade.—Its parallel in Confirmation.—Cause of failure . . 300
I. RULE OF LIFE 301

PAGE

1. Importance of a rule: i. To form habits; ii. To develop character; iii. To make life orderly; iv. To test progress. An illustration of the value of a rule 301
2. Three characteristics of a good rule: i. Definiteness; ii. Generosity; iii. Prudence . . 303
3. The matter of a rule of life: i. Prayer, (1) Private prayer, (2) Public Prayer, (3) Spiritual Reading; ii. Almsgiving; iii. Fasting . . 304

II. CULTIVATION OF HABITS OF VIRTUE AND DEVOTION . 307

1. Humility 307
2. Sincerity 307
3. Purity 308

Conclusion: The Vision of S. Thomas.—Blosius' description of the two sorts of servants of GOD.—The motto of our life 309

APPENDIX.

ON THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

Introductory: The Tractarians in treating of the Eucharistic Sacrifice appeal (1) to the Fathers and (2) to the Anglican Divines. — They formulate no theory concerning the mode of this Sacrifice. (1) The Catenæ from the Fathers are found in the writings of Keble, Forbes, and Pusey — the term sacrifice is used in a passive sense. — (2) The Catena from the Anglican Divines is given in Tract 81 313

I. THEORIES OF FIFTY YEARS AGO 314

1. The Roman doctrine of sacrifice.—Two schools; that of De Lugo requiring the destruction of the victim in sacrifice; and the more moderate school which teaches only a mystical immolation in the Sacrifice of the Mass . . . 314
2. The Tractarian view at the same period is drawn from the Fathers, but coloured by Anglican theories.—The view of the Fathers; the influence of Anglican writers . . . 315

PAGE

II. MODIFICATION OF THESE VIEWS SINCE 1870: New currents both in the Roman and Anglican Communions . 317

1. In the Roman Church.—i. Thalhofer's theory; —ii. The school of Scheeben and Schanz . 319

2. Three schools in the English Church to-day. — i. The Tractarian. — ii. The Catholic.—Bossuet's definition: The essence of the Sacrifice is in the Consecration.—CHRIST both consecrates and offers; priests are only His ministers.—The Sacrifice is a consequence of the Real Presence. — It renews the Death upon the Cross and perpetuates it, and so makes GOD propitious to us.—This does not take away from the sufficiency of that upon the Cross.—In the Holy Eucharist we apply the merits of the Cross.— There is no destruction of the Victim. — The Holy Eucharist while a proper Sacrifice depends entirely upon the Sacrifice of the Cross. — iii. The Modern school. — It is founded upon the Socinian interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which denies the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement. — The Modern view as stated by Mr. Brightman. — This view is unknown to ancient, and rejected by all (Catholic) modern commentators on Hebrews. — It is to be distinguished from the Tractarian teaching as set forth by Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, and Bishop Forbes 319

III. THE MANY DEPARTMENTS OF THEOLOGY WHICH THROW LIGHT ON THIS SUBJECT. The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice may be summed up in ten theological propositions: Four propositions must be denied as conflicting with the Catholic Faith; three admitted as consistent with it; three affirmed as necessarily comprised in and as clearly set forth by the Anglican formularies 329

Conclusion 332

LIST OF WORKS REFERRED TO IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS BOOK.

A.—General Treatises Used more or less throughout the Book.

Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, New York, 1892.
Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, Prague, 1721, 4 vols.
Benedict XIV., *Opera Omnia*, Prato, 1839, 8 vols.
Blunt, *Theological Dictionary*, London, 1870.
Harold Browne, *Articles*, London, 1860.
Melchior Canus, *De Locis Theol.*, Venice, 1776.
Churton, *Missionary's Foundation of Doctrine*, London, 1890.
Cornelius a Lapide, *Comment.*, Paris, 1865, 10 vols.
De Lugo, *De Fide*, Paris, 1868, 2 vols.
Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, Wurtzburg, 1895.
Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Edinburgh, 1884, 6 vols.
" *System of Christian Doctrine*, Edinburgh, 1888, 4 vols.
Estius, *Sent. Commentaria*, Duaci, 1616, 4 vols.
Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, Rome, 1766, 5 vols.
Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine*, New York, 1896.
Forbes, *Articles*, London, 1878.
" *The Creed*, London, 1866
Franzelin, *Opera*, Rome, 1887, 8 vols.
Gaume, *Catechism of Perseverance*, New York, 1888, 4 vols.
Guibert, *Corpus Jur. Can.*, Lyons, 1737, 3 vols.
Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, Edinburgh, 1846, 2 vols.
Hardwick, *Articles of Religion*, London, 1851.
Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, New York, 1895, 3 vols.
Hurter, *Theol. Dogm. Comp.*, Œniponte, 1893, 3 vols.
Macarius, *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, Paris, 1859, 2 vols.
Manuale Ecclesiasticorum, Rome, 1845.

Owen, *Dogmatic Theology*, London, 1887.
Palmer, *Orthodox Communion*, London, 1853.
Pearson on the Creed, Cambridge, 1859.
Pelliccia, *Polity of the Church*, London, 1883.
Percival, *Digest of Theology*, London, 1893.
Perrone, *Prelectiones Compend.*, Ratisbon, 1881, 2 vols.
Reichel, *Canon Law*, London, 1889.
Sancta Clara, *Articles*, London, 1865.
Schmalzgrüber, *Jus. Eccles. Univ.*, Rome, 1844, 12 vols.
Schouppe, *Elementa Theol. Dogm.*, Paris, 2 vols.
Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible*, New York, 1877, 4 vols.
Strong, *Manual of Theology*, London, 1892.
Suarez, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1856, 30 vols.
S. Thomas Aquinas, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1882, 34 vols.
Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, London, 1854.
" *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, New York, 1885.

B.—Works on Particular Subjects.

Alford, *Greek Testament*, Boston, 1878, 4 vols.
S. Ambrose, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1853, 4 vols.
S. Anselm, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1721.
Ante-Nicene Fathers, Edinburgh, 1873, 24 vols.
S. Augustine, *Opera Omnia*, Rotterdam, 1535, 10 vols.
Baring-Gould, *Origin and Development*, London, 1878.
" *Our Inheritance*, London, 1888.
" *The Golden Gate*, London, 1870.
Baronius, *Annales Eccles.*, Barri-Ducis, 1874, 34 vols.
S. Basil, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1834, 5 vols.
S. Bernard, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1890, 2 vols.
Bingham's *Antiquities*, London, 1878, 2 vols.
Blosius, L., *Opera*, Ingolstad, 1726.
Blunt, *Annotated Prayer-Book*, London, 1876.
" *The Reformation*, London, 1868.
Bona, *Opera Omnia*, Antwerp, 1723.
Bright, *S. Leo on the Incarnation*, London, 1886.
Campion and Beaumont, *Interleaved Prayer-Book*, London, 1880
Carter, *Doctrine of Confession*, London, 1865.
" *The Holy Eucharist*, London, 1888.
Catalanus, *Opera Omnia*, Rome, 13 vols.
Catholic Papers, Philadelphia, 1894.

S. Chrysostom, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1839, 26 vols.
Church Club Lectures, New York, 7 vols.
Churton, *Early English Church*, London, 1878.
Concil. Trident. Canones et Decreta, Munster, 1847.
" " *Catechism*, London, 1852.
Cosin's *Works*, Oxford, 1843, 5 vols.
Cramer, *Catena*, Oxford, 1843, 8 vols.
Cursus Scripturæ Sacræ, Rome, 21 vols.
Cyprian, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1726.
Dalgairns, *Holy Communion*, London, 1861.
De Albertis, *Opera*, Rome, 1783, 2 vols.
De Romestin, *Didaché*, London, 1885.
Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, London, 1881, 4 vols.
Durantius, *Rationale*, Venice, 1540.
Ewer, *Operation of the Holy Spirit*, New York, 1880.
Gavantus, *Thesaurus*, Antwerp, 1646, 3 vols.
Gibson's Codex, Oxford, 1761, 2 vols.
Grancolas, *Anciennes Liturgies*, Paris, 1774.
" *L'Antiquité des Ceremonies*, Paris, 1792.
S. Gregory the Great, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1862, 5 vols.
Hadden and Stubbs, *Councils and Eccl. Documents*, Oxford, 1869, 3 vols.
Hall, *Fasting Reception*, London, 1882.
Hamon, *Meditations*, New York, 1894, 5 vols.
Hefele, *History of the Councils*, Edinburgh, 1871, 5 vols.
Hittorpius, *De Divinis*, Cologne, 1568.
Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, London, 1860, 12 vols.
Hore, *Eighteen Centuries of the Church of England*, London, 1881.
Hutchins, *Life of Prayer*, London, 1877.
Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, London, 1894.
Jennings, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, New York, 1882.
S. Jerome, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1693, 5 vols.
S. John Damascene, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1864, 3 vols.
Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia*, Paris, 1672, 18 vols.
Lallement, *Spiritual Doctrine*, New York, 1887.
Landon, *Manual of Councils*, London, 1846.
Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, London, 1872.
Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, London, 1890, 5 vols.
Luckock, *Divine Liturgy*, New York, 1890.

Luthardt, *Fundamental Truths*, Edinburgh, 1879.
Lux Mundi, New York, 1890.
Lyndwood's *Provinciale*, Oxford, 1679.
MacColl, *Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals*, London, 1890.
Magee on the Atonement, London, 1816, 3 vols.
Manning, *Sin and its Consequences*, London.
" *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, New York, 1866.
Martene, *De Antiquis*, Antwerp, 1736, 4 vols.
Maskell, *Absolution*, London, 1849.
" *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, London, 1846.
" *Holy Baptism*, London, 1848.
" *Monumenta Ritualia*, London, 1846, 3 vols.
Medd, *One Mediator*, New York, 1884.
Moberly, *Bampton Lectures*, London, 1883.
Moehler, *Symbolism*, London, 1843.
Morinus, *De Poenitentia*, Brussels, 1685.
Mozley, *Predestination*, New York, 1878.
" *University Sermons*, London, 1879.
" *Lectures*, New York, 1883.
Alexander Natalis, *Historia Eccles.*, Bingen, 1790, 18 vols.
Neale, *History of the Eastern Church*, London, 1847, 4 vols.
" *Tetralogia Liturgica*, London, 1849.
Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Buffalo, 1887, 24 vols.
Oxenham, *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, London, 1869.
Palmer, *Origines Liturg.*, London, 1845.
Petavius, *Theol. Dogmat.*, Antwerp, 1700, 6 vols.
Pitisco, *Antiq. Roman.*, Venice, 1719, 3 vols.
Puller, *The Fast Before Communion*, London, 1891.
Pusey, *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, London, 1883.
" *The Double Procession*, London, 1876.
Ratisbonne, *S. Bernard*, New York, 1884.
Rickaby, *General Metaphysics*, New York.
Rituale Romanum, Ratisbon, 1872.
Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, London, 1871, 5 vols.
Rock, *Church of Our Fathers*, London, 1849, 4 vols.
" *Liturgy of the Mass*, London.
Romsee, *Opera Liturgica*, Mechlin, 1830, 4 vols.
Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, London, 1878.
Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharist.*, London, 1872.

Sidgwick, *History of Ethics*, London, 1886.
" *Methods of Ethics*, London, 1884.
Smith and Cheetham, *Christian Antiquities*, London, 1876, 2 vols.
Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Boston, 1877, 4 vols.
Soames, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, London, 1876.
Stephen, *Science of Ethics*, New York, 1882.
Suicer, *Thesaurus*, Amsterdam, 1728, 2 vols.
Suidas, *Lexicon*, Cambridge, 1705, 3 vols.
Trench, *Mediæval Church History*, London, 1879.
Webb, *The Holy Spirit*, London, 1889.
Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, London, 1889.
" *Gospel of S. John*, New York.
Wilberforce, *The Eucharist*, London, 1854.
Wilkins, *Concilia*, London, 1737, 4 vols.
Wirgman, *Gifts of the Spirit*, London, 1890.

CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE.

CHAPTER I.

GOD.

Introductory. "Quid est Deus?"

MORE than six hundred years ago, in that glorious monastery the home of the Benedictines, erected by their great master himself on the summit of Monte Cassino, there lived a child of noble birth, the nephew of the Abbot, who had been sent there to be trained in the love of GOD, in prayer, and in those studies which constituted the best education of that day. Though scarcely arrived at the age of reason, he one day asked of the Monks his instructors a profound question. Lifting up to them his great inquiring eyes, he said, "Quid est Deus?—What is GOD?" And to the partial replies which they gave him, and which did not satisfy his thirsty mind, he re-iterated again and again, "No, but *what* is GOD?" That child was S. Thomas Aquinas, who became the greatest doctor of the Church, one of its most eminent saints, and one of the most profound intellects the world has ever known. As a child he asked this question; to its answer he devoted his busy life, and to-day no theologian would

venture to pronounce upon any important question without asking, "What does S. Thomas say?"

With this question, "What is GOD?" we must begin our instructions, and the subject is of far greater importance than people realize. The whole end of theology is the knowledge of GOD, Whom to know is life eternal. And yet how often all questions concerning the Nature of GOD are passed over as belonging only to the realm of abstract thought and therefore too difficult to be answered except by great theologians!

Practical value of accurate knowledge of GOD in times of trial.

But unless we have some clear idea of GOD'S Character and of our relation to Him, on which to build up much of the practical side of our spiritual life, we shall be in danger, in times of great trial or sorrow, either of losing our faith in GOD or at least of being left without that consolation which alone can make the trial both endurable and profitable. Because we are ignorant of GOD'S Nature we often come to substitute for the GOD Who created us and all other beings a God who is the creation of our own imagination. This is proved by the frequency with which we hear from the lips of some one weighed down by crushing sorrow or misfortune the sad complaint, "GOD is cruel in dealing so hardly with me!"—the frequency with which we see sufferers in a state of rebellion against GOD. Such an expression, such a state would be impossible in one who really believed in GOD,—that is, who realized the Divine Nature. It comes from ignorance or misconception in regard to GOD'S very Nature and Character; for one might as well accuse the sun of being the cause of darkness as accuse GOD of being cruel. Darkness is caused by the earth turning away from the sun; in light itself there *can be* no darkness. Suffering is caused by man turning away from GOD, that

is, by sin; in love there can be no cruelty; and if we believe that GOD is omniscient,—that is, that He knows all things, all our sorrow and pain, and knows far better than ourselves what we need, our possibilities and our future,—if we believe that GOD is infinitely wise, that He is omnipotent, that He is holy and that He is love, it is impossible to think GOD cruel or hard, impossible to rebel against One Who is love. So that when any one is in a state of rebellion against GOD it is either from ignorance or misconception regarding GOD'S Character, or from lack of any real belief in GOD at all.

And as a basis for prayer.

Then again, an adequate realization of the Nature and Attributes of GOD is necessary as a basis for all effectual prayer. With it prayer will never fail, the suppliant will never be discouraged. Without it we are likely, as S. James says, to "ask and receive not, because we ask amiss." Believing in GOD, and understanding (at least to some extent) what GOD is, we shall have a devotion to GOD'S Will and a perfect trust in His goodness and love for us. We shall be willing always to tarry GOD'S leisure; we shall be strong, and He will comfort our hearts.

1. GOD'S Nature and Attributes.

What is GOD? GOD is Spirit; that is, He is without body, parts, or passions; He is pure Essence, immaterial, Whose proper and essential act is to think; He is eternal Energy. (Here it must be noted, that with GOD thought is not a process, as with us, but a state; so that premises and conclusion are with Him simultaneous, if such an expression can be used when time and sequence are eliminated.) He is absolutely perfect, by which we mean that whatever we know of goodness or perfection exists in GOD absolutely, or to the utmost extent. He is incomprehensible; that is,

He cannot be completely embraced by the human mind, and this follows from the fact that He is infinite while we are finite. We can know much about GOD, but we cannot know Him fully. He is ineffable; that is, He cannot be described perfectly in human language; so that nothing more is possible for us than to study GOD from various points of view, taking certain attributes, or qualities, and showing that they can be affirmed of Him, and of others that they can be denied of Him. Thus, we say that GOD is all-holy, which is an affirmation; and again, that He is immutable, which denies that there is any change in Him. But we must remember that in the latter case we are using a negation because we have no word which adequately expresses the positive idea corresponding to the negation. Moreover we must be very careful to notice that these attributes of GOD are not anything distinct from Himself; they may not be thought of as something added to GOD, as if GOD could be thought of without them. And yet, while there is no distinction between the absolute attributes of GOD and His Essence, there is a distinction between the attributes themselves; for instance, His justice is logically distinct from His wisdom or His love.

1. Metaphysical Essence.

Among GOD'S absolute attributes we may consider first what is called the Metaphysical Essence, by which is understood that which distinguishes a being from all other beings, and which can be conceived as the source of all else that belongs to it. The majority of theologians assign Aseity, or Self-Existence, as the Metaphysical Essence of GOD; as we read in Exodus iii. 14, "GOD said unto Moses, I am that I am." Aseity (from the Latin words *a se*) affirms that GOD is Self-derived, therefore that He is the Uncaused, Necessary

Being ; and in this is involved all else that is true concerning Him.

If we next take some of His incommunicable attributes (that is, those which we cannot conceive as being shared even in an imperfect degree by man), we shall find that : 2. Incommunicable Attributes.

GOD is INFINITE. This follows from His Aseity, from His being Uncaused, for the limitation of an effect is the result of its having a cause; also because He is the Source of all Being. Negatively, we mean by the Infinity of GOD that the limitations which bind us do not confine Him ; positively, that every perfection is possessed by GOD absolutely and exhaustively. i. Infinity.

GOD is ONE. It would be impossible to conceive of the existence of two *Infinite* Beings, for there would be no difference between them except in so far as one was wanting in something that the other had, which lack would be inconsistent with Infinity. ii. Unity.

GOD is SIMPLE ; that is, He is not composed of parts, nor capable of division into parts. Anthropomorphism, the representation of GOD under the form of a man, as when the Bible speaks of the Eye of GOD, or the Ear of GOD, or the Hand of GOD, is simply a metaphorical accommodation to the weakness of the human mind and the poverty of human language, and the terms used are symbolical of the powers of which they are the instruments ; for instance, the Eye symbolizes the Knowledge of GOD, etc. iii. Simplicity.

GOD is IMMUTABLE ; that is, He cannot change ; for if He could change, He must change from a more perfect to a less perfect state, or vice versâ ; that is, change would imply some imperfection in GOD, and so would contradict His attribute of absolute Perfec- iv. Immutability.

tion. This Immutability, too, proceeds necessarily from His Simplicity and Unity, for a thing is said to be changed in regard to time or form, neither of which enters into the account of the Divine Essence, Which is absolutely Simple and One.

v. Eternity.

GOD is ETERNAL. Eternity is sometimes loosely applied to that which has no end, but strictly it signifies that which exists necessarily and has no beginning, end, or change. Eternity is distinguished from Immutability in that Immutability is only the negation of change, while Eternity expresses something more—duration and perseverance in Essence, together with the negation of measure. The celebrated definition which S. Thomas adopted from Boëthius is as follows: "Eternity is a simultaneously full and perfect possession of interminable life." Eternity, therefore, is to time what Immensity is to space, and both belong to GOD necessarily because He is Infinite and Self-Existing.

vi. Immensity.

GOD is IMMENSE. His Immensity is closely allied to His Eternity. GOD is Immense or Incomprehensible because He is independent of all conditions of space, so that He is present in all space; not by extension, as a material body, nor definitely, as the soul of man is present in his body, for both of these modes imply limitation; but GOD is wholly everywhere—that is, He is present by His Essence everywhere. GOD'S Immensity follows from His Infinity, as that does from His Aseity.

vii. Omnipresence.

GOD is also OMNIPRESENT. Some take this attribute to be the same as Immensity; strictly it is not identical with Immensity, because it is a result of it, for Immensity is an *absolute* attribute, while Omnipresence is *relative*, depending on the existence of space, so that

GOD has not been Omnipresent from eternity, but only from the beginning of Creation.

We now pass to the communicable attributes of GOD. These are qualities which are called "communicable" not because we share them with GOD but because in man, created in the image of GOD, a reflection or likeness of them is found. They are often grouped by theologians under the title of "the life of GOD." 3. Communicable Attributes.

GOD is SPIRIT. By Spirit we mean a living Being unlimited by the conditions of time and space under which matter as we know it exists; and in Spirit we may distinguish two faculties, Intellect and Will. The exercise of Intellect constitutes the Divine Knowledge as that of Will constitutes GOD'S Power. The fact that GOD is not subject to conditions of time and space follows necessarily from His Eternity and Immensity; that He is a Living Being, from His having Knowledge and Will. He is, therefore, Spirit. i. Spirit.

GOD is LIFE. This we have just shown; but when we speak of the Life of GOD we express our belief in GOD not only as possessing Life, but as the Cause and Source of life and being in all creatures. As S. John says, "In Him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men." (S. John i. 4; *cf.* Acts xvii. 25 and 28.) ii. Life.

GOD is KNOWLEDGE. The infinity of this Knowledge we express by the word "Omniscient," by which we mean that all objects of knowledge are at all times actually present to GOD'S Consciousness. Nothing is so minute as to escape this Omniscience. And yet this does not imply the perception of ever so many separate things, but that His Unity enables Him to see all things that are or can be, in all their relations to each other, actual and possible. iii. Knowledge.

iv. Will.

The WILL of GOD. By the will we mean that faculty which chooses among objects which the intellect brings before it, selecting some and rejecting others. It is also a function of the will to aim at an end and consciously to choose means for its attainment. The primary object of the Will of GOD is the Divine Essence. Creatures are its secondary object. There are two well-known methods of treating the Will of GOD.

(1) Peter Lombard's view.

One is that of Peter Lombard, who distinguishes between the "Voluntas beneplaciti," GOD's good pleasure, or Secret Will, which is the internal action by which GOD wills anything, and the "Voluntas signi," or revealed Will, by which He shows by some outward indication that He wills anything. Of these the first is always fulfilled; the latter is sometimes unfulfilled.

(2) S. John Damascene's view.

The other method is that of S. John Damascene, who distinguishes between the Antecedent and the Consequent Will. The Antecedent will (*Θέλημα*) is when GOD wills anything without regard to circumstances, as when He wills all men to be saved (1 Tim. ii. 4). The Consequent Will (*Βουλή*) is when GOD wills anything with a view to certain circumstances, the contrary whereof He would will were not the circumstances what they are, *e.g.*, He wills all men to be saved on the condition that they co-operate with His Grace, but this condition being unfulfilled in some He wills them to be lost. The first or Antecedent Will emanates from the Goodness of GOD, and is conditional; the second or Consequent Will embraces His Justice as well as His Mercy, taking account of man's free will, and is absolute.

GOD's Will was (and is) free in creating, not only

in determining whether He would put forth His creative Power at all, but whether He would create the Universe He did, or some other.

v. Moral Qualities.

While remembering how inadequate human language is to express the Character of GOD, we can ascribe to Him the possession of certain Moral Qualities ; indeed, we know from the Perfection of His Being, that He must have all these Qualities so far as they do not involve any imperfection.

(1) Wisdom.

He has WISDOM. This belongs partly to the Intellect, enabling it to see the means which are suitable for carrying out a given end, but chiefly to the Will, which employs those means which the Intellect proposes as useful.

(2) Holiness.

He is ALL-HOLY, for His Will is in perfect harmony with the infinite Perfection of His Being, which furnishes the motive for all His activity outside Himself; so that He loves His creatures for the good that He sees in them, while He abhors all evil.

(3) Justice.

He is JUST in dealing out rewards and punishments, and is the Source of all human justice.

(4) Truth.

He is TRUTH. The Holiness and Justice of GOD taken together with His Knowledge necessitate His Veracity—for He can neither deceive nor be deceived.

(5) Goodness.

He is GOOD in providing for the welfare of His creatures, and especially in showing Pity, Mercy, Gentleness, Long-Suffering and Patience towards sinners.

(6) Happiness.

He is infinitely HAPPY ; this necessarily follows from His possessing all good within Himself.

vi. Power.

GOD is OMNIPOTENT. The Power of GOD is not one of His Moral Attributes, but like them it is conceived of as in close relation with His Will. When we speak of GOD as Almighty, or Omnipotent, we use a word which strictly means not so much that He is able to do all things as that He is Sovereign or Master

of all, that He is the Source of all Power. And if it be said that GOD is not Omnipotent because not able to deny Himself, or to lie, or to sin, there are two answers. (1) If any one say that GOD cannot do anything bad or capricious, the inability is not due to deficiency of Power nor to limitation from without, but to the fact that being Omniscient and All-Wise, He cannot be deceived into preferring that which is less good; for it is impossible for the Perfect to choose to be less perfect. (2) Another answer shows that the very propositions quoted involve a contradiction. A God who could sin would be as inconceivable, or rather as self-contradictory, as a square circle.

(1) Absolute Power.

Under the attribute of Power we distinguish between GOD'S Absolute Power and His Ordinary Power. By His *Absolute* Power we do not mean that He can do anything inconsistent with His other attributes, for as we have shown this is inconceivable and self-contradictory.

(2) Ordinary Power.

By His *Ordinary* Power we mean the free and eternal decrees of His Will, by which He generally governs the world in accordance with a certain order, commonly called Universal Law; for instance, He maintains matter in existence and in the exercise of certain powers, such as the so-called law of gravitation by which a piece of iron falling into the water ordinarily sinks to the bottom in virtue of the attraction of the earth. In His Providence also there is an ordinary course followed, as when men are guided by the Ministry of the Church. But deviations from these ordinary courses occasionally occur, as when the axe-head floated in the days of Elisha, and when Saul was converted by the Voice from Heaven on his way to Damascus. These extraordinary deviations, which mark GOD'S *Absolute* Power,

sometimes attract notice and are called miracles. Perhaps similar occurrences may be frequent, but may not be observed.

4. Love.

Lastly, GOD is LOVE. This is the aspect of GOD'S Essence on which S. John chiefly dwells—"GOD is Love" (1 S. John, iv. 8, 16). We may ask, What is love? for we are capable of loving: now, indeed, imperfectly; hereafter, if we attain to the Beatific Vision, perfectly. Love, we may say, is the outpouring of the being towards personal objects. It seeks the highest good of the one who is loved, not counting the cost to self. It cannot rest till its love has been answered by love; and yet love is independent of this reward which it expects; as S. Paul says (2 Cor. xii. 15), "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved." Love is GOD'S very Being, so that all GOD'S moral attributes may be regarded as manifestations or attributes of the Divine Love.

GOD'S Attributes necessary, not arbitrary.

Here we must bring this part of the chapter to an end, though there are still some attributes of GOD of which we have not treated. But we must not pass from the subject without carefully observing that GOD'S attributes are not arbitrary but necessary, which means that they have not been assigned to GOD by the speculations of theologians, but that human thought cannot conceive of GOD apart from these attributes if once it admits GOD to be Self-Existent and Infinite.

Manifested in His Providence.

We observed at the beginning of the chapter that it is of real importance for us to know and understand what the attributes of GOD are, in order that we may know something of the Character of GOD and of His relations to us; for upon a recognition of this must depend not only much of our spiritual life but also our

attitude towards many of the problems which have constantly to be met in our practical life in the world. We have already noticed that a realization of GOD'S attributes of Omniscience , Omnipotence, Justice, and Love will save us from the sin of thinking GOD cruel or unjust and so rebelling against His Providence when it involves suffering. If a mother roughly snatches from the hand of her child a sharp knife with which the child is in danger of hurting itself, we do not call that mother cruel, although perhaps the child by its cries indicates some such opinion. We are GOD'S children, and must rest in His absolute Goodness and Love, ascribing to our own want of knowledge the apparent difficulties of His Providence ; and if we realize these attributes of GOD, instead of rebelling against GOD'S Will we shall have a great and loving devotion to that Will, preparing ourselves by earnest and humble prayer to co-operate in GOD'S good purpose for us, whatever it may be. In the same way, a grasp of GOD'S Sovereignty will enable us both to witness with equanimity the attacks of the world upon the Church and to endure those moral inequalities which so perplex people of little faith; for we shall say, "The LORD is King, be the people never so impatient: He sitteth between the Cherubim, be the earth never so unquiet" (Ps. xcix. 1).

Having considered what is involved in the Church's idea of the One Personal GOD, of Whom and to Whom and through Whom "are all things : to Whom be glory for ever" (Rom. xi. 36) we must consider next that inner Life of GOD, of which our only source of knowledge is revelation, and which we speak of as the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

II. The Holy Trinity.

The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is one of those absolute mysteries which human reason by itself could

never have discovered or even thought possible. It is probably one of the chief of those "deep things of GOD" which S. Paul tells us "no man knoweth but the SPIRIT of GOD," but that "GOD hath revealed them unto us by His SPIRIT" (1 Cor. ii. 10, 11); that is, the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is purely a matter of revelation; but having been revealed it becomes an article of faith and enables us to explain, develop and correct the erroneous views of GOD derived merely from natural theology.

Definition.

In the Unity of the Godhead there are three Persons, the FATHER, the SON and the HOLY GHOST, really distinct in Person, yet in all respects co-equal, and of one Substance. The FATHER is Unbegotten; the SON, Begotten of the FATHER; the HOLY GHOST, Proceeding from the FATHER and the SON. All things in GOD are common to the Three Persons, except where there is the opposition of relation, *i.e.*, those peculiar characteristics which make them to be severally Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

In the Internal Constitution, if we may use the term, of the Blessed Trinity, we may notice that:

1. One Essence.

The Essence, Substance or Nature of GOD is One, so that though there are three Persons in the Godhead, there are not three GODS.

2. Two Processions.

In the Divine Essence there are two Processions, that of the SON and that of the HOLY GHOST. The word "Procession" means the origination of one thing from another. Where the thing originated is not really distinct in essence from the principle which originated it, the procession is termed "immanent procession."

i. Procession of the SON, Eternal Generation.

The Procession of the SON or WORD from the FATHER is called a Generation. The SON proceeds from the FATHER by an act of the intellect, and

this act is termed "Eternal Generation," by which we mean not only that there never was a time when the FATHER existed without generating the SON, but also that the act of Generation is a *continuous* act, so that if, as some heretics teach, there was during the historic life of the Incarnate WORD on earth a separation between the FATHER and the SON, both FATHER and SON would have ceased to be, inasmuch as, the act of Generation being interrupted by the separation, there would have been no SON, and there being no SON there could have been no FATHER.

ii. Procession of the HOLY SPIRIT, one Spiration.

The HOLY SPIRIT proceeds eternally from the FATHER and the SON, not as from two origins but as from one, and not by two spirations but by one spiration. He proceeds, therefore, by an act of the will, and as we have no name for this procession suggested by what occurs in man, and as the act of intellect by which the FATHER generates the SON is virtually distinct from the act of will by which the FATHER with the SON breathes forth the HOLY SPIRIT, the general word "Spiration" (Breathing) is used for this procession of the HOLY SPIRIT. "Active Spiration" is used to describe the act in the Person from Whom He proceeds; "Passive Spiration," in Him Who proceeds. As the HOLY SPIRIT, like the SON, is not distinct in Essence from the FATHER, from Whom He proceeds, this also is a case of Immanent Procession. The HOLY SPIRIT proceeds from the FATHER only as from the Source, Fountain or Beginning. He is the Eternal Love of the FATHER and the SON mutually breathed forth by them, and is as it were the Bond of Union in the Eternal Trinity. As the FATHER is the Manifestation of the *Power*,

and the SON of the *Intellect*, so is the HOLY GHOST of the *Will* of the Deity. Our LORD in reference to the Temporal Mission of the HOLY GHOST speaks in the same verse of His proceeding from the FATHER and being sent by Himself: "But when the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the FATHER, even the SPIRIT of Truth, Which proceedeth from the FATHER, He shall testify of Me" (S. John, xv. 26).

3. Three Persons.

Thus there are in the Godhead three distinct Persons, so that while Each is severally GOD and LORD, and possessed of all the Divine Attributes, which (as we have seen) are identical with the Divine Essence, they yet are distinct in Person, so that the FATHER is not the SON or the HOLY GHOST, nor is the SON the FATHER or the HOLY GHOST, nor is the HOLY GHOST the FATHER or the SON.

When we use the term "Person" we are using the equivalent of the word "Hypostasis." Originally this word "hypostasis" and the word "substance" were exactly synonymous, and signified that which is conceived of as capable of existing by itself without needing the support of anything else. After the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362, at which it was explained that the word "hypostasis" was used in the special sense of "personal subsistence," it was added to the stock of theological terms and received authoritative sanction by its adoption in the Synodical epistle of the first General Council of Constantinople, and now "hypostasis" may be defined as a substance which is complete in itself, independent, and capable of acting. The Latin "persona" has been defined by Boëthius as "the individual substance of a rational nature." The term "person," however, is not used of the Divine

Persons in exactly the same sense in which we use it of human personality, and from its etymology it can be perverted to a Sabellian meaning; so that in using it of the Holy Trinity we must carefully preserve its theological force.

4. Four Relations.

There are also in the Godhead four Relations. By the term "relation" we mean a condition or order which arises from the contemplation of a being which we contemplate simultaneously with another being which is in some respects distinct from it. One is then said to be related to the other. The first is called the "subject" of the relation; the other, the "term"; and that by which the relation is constituted, the "foundation." For example, the relation of two brothers, or of a father to a son, is in each case founded on parentage.

Since the nature of GOD is One, the Three Persons can be distinguished by nothing but their Relations, and as each of the two Processions gives rise to a Relation between the Principle and Him That proceeds, there are therefore four Relations; for in each Procession we may consider the Relation of the Producer to the Produced, and of the Produced to the Producer.

Thus, between the FATHER and the SON we have the Relations of Paternity and Filiation. The second Procession, that of the HOLY GHOST, furnishes the Relations of Active Spiration and Passive Spiration.

5. Five Notions.

There are also in the Holy Trinity five Notions. That by which one of the Divine Persons is distinguished from another is called a "notion" because it makes the Person "known." Thus, it belongs to the First Person only to be Unproduced and to be FATHER. The Second Person alone is SON, and, together with the First Person, is the Spirator (or

Breather); and the Third Person is the SPIRIT (or Breath). Thus, the five Notions are Innascibility, Paternity, Filiation, Active Spiration and Passive Spiration.

6. Perichoresis.

The Doctrine of the Perichoresis, Circuminsession or Circumincession—all of which words signify the act of settling round about a place (*περίχωρος, circum-insideo*, or *circum-incedo*)—is the doctrine which specially guards the Holy Trinity from Tritheism. It expresses the co-existence and presence of the Persons of the Holy Trinity in one another by reason of their identity of Nature and Essence; as our LORD said, "I am in the FATHER and the FATHER in Me" (S. John xiv. 11); and again, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the FATHER" (xiv. 9). The entire passage proves (1) the *distinction* of Persons, as against the Sabellians; (2) their *equality*, as against the Arians, and (3) the *oneness* of their Nature, as against the Tritheists.

7. Errors of Sabellianism and Tritheism.

The two chief errors regarding the Holy Trinity into which men have fallen are Sabellianism and Tritheism.

The first of these confounds the Persons, and so denies the Trinity, by asserting that they are only three names, modes or characters of one Person. This doctrine is sometimes called "Patripassionism," for it taught that it was really the FATHER Who suffered on Calvary.

The opposite error is Tritheism, whereby men have taught that in the Trinity are three Substances in all things similar, as if there were three Deities. The more extreme Kenotists, or teachers of our LORD'S ignorance, in the present day are practically Tritheists, in that they teach a separation between the Second

Person, or the WORD, and the FATHER, and thus by destroying the Unity of the Godhead they make a plurality of Gods.

8. The five views of GOD.

While the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity could never have been discovered by human thought unaided, yet having been revealed it helps to explain and correct the erroneous views of GOD which have arisen from natural theology. The views of GOD which have prevailed in the world, so far as they have reached a distinctness worthy of recognition, may be classed under five heads: i. Pantheism, ii. Polytheism, iii. Dualism, iv. Monotheism without Personal Differentiation, and v. Monotheism with Personal Differentiation.

In the last, which is the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, we have all that is true in the other four, with the exclusion of all that is erroneous.

i. Pantheism.

That which is true in Pantheism is the Immanence of GOD everywhere in the Universe; that which is false is the identification of the universe with GOD. GOD'S attribute of Immensity or Omnipresence covers all that is true in Pantheism, while the doctrine of His Personality preserves the distinction between Himself and the creatures which He made.

ii. Polytheism.

Polytheism, with its multiplicity of Gods who represent functions of nature, and its hero-worship, was a blind attempt to satisfy the craving of the human heart for something Divine which is capable of being "touched with the feeling of our infirmities"; which dwells amongst us and is in some sense human. This need Christianity supplies in the Doctrine of the Incarnation. The other good quality of Polytheism is its recognition of a social phase in the Divine Existence, which Christianity corrects and gives accurate expres-

sion to in the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Polytheism, however, is entirely at fault both in its physics and its morals; because the world without an acknowledged Head or First Cause is hopelessly unintelligible, and because with a multitude of Gods who only reproduce man's weakness and vices there can be no fixed standard of morals. These errors Christianity meets by teaching One GOD, Uncaused, but the Cause of all; the Universal Sovereign, with the attributes of Justice, Goodness and Love, etc.

iii. Dualism.

Dualism gathers up under the two divisions of Good and Evil all the antagonisms and miseries of nature, representing them as two kingdoms which are co-eternal, and therefore making the conflict absolutely hopeless because endless. Christianity, on the other hand, recognizes the powers of darkness and evil as in opposition to GOD, but as in no sense either co-eternal or co-equal with Him. The devils are but rebellious creatures of GOD, really in their malice subserving the Divine purposes, and ultimately they will be compelled to glorify Him by their failures and defeat.

iv. Monotheism without, etc.

And lastly, Monotheism without the differentiation of Persons witnesses to that supreme truth upon which Christianity is built, the Unity of GOD; but such Monotheism has the fatal weakness that it cannot really be thought out. The Unitarian imagines his conception of GOD to be simpler than the Christian's, and to unthinking minds this may seem to be true; and yet Unitarianism cannot really be expressed in terms of accurate thought, for it fails to account for such a GOD as it demands.

Since GOD is *Eternal* and GOD is *Love* (as Unitarians believe), it may well be asked, "What was the

eternal object of GOD'S love?—not creatures, for they had no existence until GOD by an act of His Will, at a certain point in time, called them into being. Unitarianism then demands an Eternal and Omnipotent God, Whose essential character is *Love*, but Who existed in the great eternity before time absolutely solitary and without any object of His love; and Who even after creation has no other object of love than the creatures which He Himself has called out of nothing. Such a God, if not inconceivable, presents a difficulty to which thought supplies no satisfactory solution.

Whereas the Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity, although absolutely mysterious, is quite conceivable, and meets just such difficulties as this.

v. Christianity. So we see that Christianity, with its conception of a Triune GOD, is the fulfilment of all that was true in previous religions, while it eliminates all that was crude and unworthy and false. However much, therefore, the doctrine of the Trinity may transcend human reason, it is not only not contrary to it but it distinctly claims to be the most reasonable mode of conceiving GOD as essentially Personal.

CHAPTER II.

THE CREATION, AND FALL OF THE ANGELS.

Introductory.

IN the Creed we say not only that we "believe in one GOD" but that we believe that He is the "Maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible."

Creation the overflow of GOD'S Love.

GOD is Love, and the overflow of GOD'S love upon the world was the Creation. In this Creation GOD acted purely of His goodness and by His almighty power, not to increase His own happiness, nor to acquire perfection, but (by the good which He imparted to His creatures) to manifest that perfection which was in Him. And first, we must remember that GOD was perfectly free in creating, not only in determining whether He would use His creative power at all, but also whether He would create the particular universe He did create, or some other which He preferred to it.

Theological meaning of the term "Creation."

The word "create" in theology means "to produce out of nothing." It was originally a Latin word and in that language it is used of *every* sort of production. But there is no word in Latin to express the act of production out of nothing, for the possibility of such a production had never occurred to men. The Christian writers, therefore, having learned from revelation that in fact this world had been produced out of nothing, saw the necessity of having a word to express such an idea, and chose the word "create."

In the Hebrew of the first chapter of Genesis the word for "create" is "bara," which in the Old Testament is used only of GOD and always without mention of pre-existing matter. The few apparent exceptions to this statement which may be found will be observed, on careful examination, really to justify it, as conveying the idea of an exercise of power similar to creation. The word "bara" occurs only three times in the account of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis, in verses 1, 21 and 27. Elsewhere the words "make," "form," "bring forth," etc., are employed, implying pre-existing seminal matter. These three acts of creation in verses 1, 21 and 27 may be taken roughly as belonging to those three "beginnings" of which science can tell us nothing—the beginning of matter, the beginning of life, the beginning of mind.

Three creative acts in Gen. i.

It is in accordance with GOD'S ordinary working to use means, and from materials of a lower order constantly to produce something better. So in our LORD'S first miracle at Cana of Galilee, the water was made wine, the wine was not created out of nothing; and in the second creation or restoration of the chaos described in the first chapter of Genesis after the first verse, the materials of the ruined world were used, and out of them the earth was re-formed and made fit for the habitation of man. Again, in the creation of Adam, GOD formed his body from the dust of the earth, and *created* only his soul. And when the moral nature of man, created so perfect in Adam, was corrupted by the Fall, it was not cast away. GOD did not create a new order or race, but out of fallen humanity took that Body and Soul which, hypostatically united with the Eternal WORD in the Incarnation, were to be raised to the Throne of Heaven.

GOD'S use of means.

We do not know how many creative acts there may have been, and of course there is nothing to limit GOD in creating at any time; but both Holy Scripture and the study of natural science lead us to think that while the creative acts were but few, that which was created was endowed with the germ of all future development under GOD'S guiding power. The creation of the substance of things must have taken place in an instant. The LORD "spake the word, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created" (Ps. cxlviii. 5). And the reason is that there can be no middle term between non-existence and existence. But substance after it has been created still needs the distinct exercise of Divine power to *preserve* it, for every creature is essentially and continuously dependent on GOD for all that it has. This is what we call GOD'S "conservation" of created substance, which, however, leaves room for the working of secondary or concurrent causes.

Creative acts probably few.

Creation instantaneous.

Conservation.

The world was created "in time," that is, a certain finite number of days and years had elapsed since the instant when GOD "created the heavens and the earth." Before that instant there was no actual time, for time implies succession of events; but there was the possibility of time, for GOD'S freedom teaches us that He could have put forth His creative power before He did. So that we see that nothing outside GOD can be eternal in such a sense as to be independent of Him, and also that no created thing has existed from eternity.

The world created in time.

The first chapter of Genesis seems to be divided into two distinct parts. In the first verse we are told that "in the beginning GOD created the heavens and the earth." A vast period seems to have elapsed between

Gen. i. divided into two parts.

1. A Creation.

2. A Restoration after a Catastrophe.

the first and second verses, when the earth became "without form and void," or as the Hebrew words might be better translated, "wasteness and desolation," the very words used implying that the universe had existed in a different state before. We cannot conceive, for instance, of the creation of a ruin, because the word "ruin" involves the idea of a previous history and of a catastrophe or the lapse of ages which has caused the ruin. What the catastrophe was which ruined the primeval earth revelation does not distinctly tell us, though it is very generally thought by theologians that it was the fall of the Angels who when they "prevailed not" in heaven were "cast out into the earth" (Rev. xii. 8, 9). Whatever it was, GOD permitted it that He might overrule it according to His gracious purpose.

In the remainder of the chapter we have the details of the restoration or re-formation of the earth to prepare it for the abode of man.

No authoritative theory of the Six Days.

There are many views in regard to the interpretation of the work of the Six Days. As the Church has not put her imprimatur on any particular theory, we may hold any which does not conflict with other parts of revelation.

The end or purpose of Creation.

The end or purpose of creation may be considered from two points of view, (1) the end of the work; (2) the end of the Worker. The end of the work of creation is to obtain glory for GOD, especially through man. The end of the Worker is the fulfilment of the Will of the Creator. GOD was not moved to create by anything outside Himself, for besides GOD before the creation nothing existed; and to look for the motive of His Will is to attempt to assign the cause for the First Cause. GOD loved Himself in the bond of the

Motive of Creation, GOD'S Free Will and Love.

Holy Trinity and willed that this love should extend to the partial representations of His own love that are found in creatures; that is, creation was the overflow, so to speak, of GOD'S love. We must remember that GOD does not love His creatures because they do Him honour, but, on the contrary, that it is the sign of His love that He allows them to do Him honour.

All Three Persons co-operated in Creation.

The work of creation may be assigned to each of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity. Although it proceeded from the FATHER as a Source, yet it was not of the FATHER alone, for He made all things by the SON and through the SPIRIT, Who "moved upon the face of the waters."

Creation of things spiritual and material.

When the Creed teaches us to believe that GOD created "heaven and earth" and "all things visible and invisible," we are to understand that He created the world of matter and of spirit,—"the heavens" standing for the spiritual world, or the Angel hosts, and "the earth" representing the material world. It is generally supposed that GOD created "the heavens," that is, the spiritual world of Angels, first; because we read in the book of Job (xxxviii. 4–7), that when GOD "laid the foundations of the earth," "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of GOD shouted for joy." The spiritual world may have existed for some time before the material world was called into being.

I. The Angels. Definition.

Angels may be defined as "spiritual substances," or, according to S. John Damascene, as "intellectual beings, ever in motion, possessing free will, incorporeal, ministering to GOD, having an immortal nature, the form and limit of whose being the Creator alone knoweth." When we say they are "incorporeal and immaterial," we mean as *we understand* the terms, for

probably the Divinity alone is really immaterial and incorporeal; and while it is certain that the Angels have not material bodies such as we have, yet it is not at all certain that bodies need to be "material," and so some theologians think that Angels may have spiritual bodies with the power of assuming form and shape. They certainly have the power of manifesting themselves under different forms, as the Bible shows us again and again.

Have they bodies?

Angelic knowledge intuitive.

It is commonly thought that the knowledge of the Angels is intuitive, and not arrived at by the process of reasoning. This knowledge does not extend to the secret thoughts of men, for that belongs to GOD alone. There are many other matters which the Angels do not know, such as the end of the world, for "of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven" (S. Mark, xiii. 32), or what is the number of the elect; and they probably have no *natural* knowledge of such mysteries as the Blessed Trinity. They learn from the Church, as S. Paul tells us (Eph. iii. 8–11), and, as S. Peter says, they "desire to look into" the sufferings of CHRIST and the glory that shall follow (1 S. Peter, i. 11, 12).

II. The number and functions of the Angels.

The nine choirs.

We do not know how many Angels there are, but they are very numerous, and apparently divided into nine choirs. Four of these are mentioned in the Old Testament: first, Angels, the lowest order; second, the Cherubim—GOD "placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims" (Gen. iii. 24); third, the Seraphim—"I saw also the LORD sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and His train filled the temple. Above it stood the Seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly" (Isaiah, vi.

1, 2); fourth, the Archangels, for we read in the book of Daniel (xii. 1) of Michael the Prince, who was the Guardian Angel of the Jews, and we are told in the Epistle of S. Jude (verse 9) that Michael was an Archangel. (Some theologians, however, think S. Michael was a Seraph and only called by S. Jude an *Arch*angel as a title of honor.) The remaining five we find in the New Testament, in different parts of S. Paul's Epistles; four of them — Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers — in Col. i. 16, and one of them in Eph. i. 21, "principality and power and *might* and dominion," where "might" is understood to mean "Virtues."

The functions of the different choirs.

S. Dionysius the Areopagite, whose writings have very largely influenced the opinions of theologians of the Church in regard to the Angels, in a treatise entitled "The Hierarchy of Heaven" arranges the nine choirs of Angels in three hierarchies, with three choirs or orders in each. It is supposed that the First Hierarchy, who are in the very Presence of GOD, nearest to Him, reflect the Light and the Will of GOD to the Second, and the Second to the Third; that GOD speaks directly to the First, and they pass on GOD'S commands to those who are to execute them.

1. First Hierarchy.

The three orders which constitute the First Hierarchy are Seraphim, Cherubim, and Thrones.

i. Seraphim.

The word "Seraph" means "fire," and signifies that the Seraphim are especially full of love, that they are burning with love of GOD; so the Seraphim may be considered as nearest to GOD, living, as it were, in the fire of His love.

ii. Cherubim.

The next order is that of the Cherubim. This word means "knowledge." The Cherubim are those who have the special gift of supernatural wisdom; as the Seraphim burn with love of GOD, so the Cherubim

find their satisfaction in gazing into the mysteries of GOD. The sin of Adam, which caused him to be driven out of Eden, was eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; and so the Cherubim, whose characteristic is especially the gift of knowledge, were placed at the entrance of Eden to prevent his coming back and taking also the fruit of the tree of life.

iii. Thrones. The third order is the Thrones. They are distinguished for their especial devotion and submission to the Will of GOD. The word which is translated "throne" is in the Greek Church always translated "Altar"; the Altar in that Church is called the Throne; and some think that these three, the Seraphim, Cherubim, and Thrones, bear up the Throne of GOD. Some also call them the Counsellors of GOD, because having received the Counsel of GOD they counsel the others in regard to it.

2. Second Hierarchy. iv. Dominions. The Second Hierarchy is composed of Dominions, Principalities and Powers. Dominions are those who are especially filled with zeal for the Sovereignty of GOD. From the First Hierarchy they receive GOD'S Will and carry out that Will in ruling the kingdoms

v. Principalities. which belong to GOD. Principalities are noted for their purity of intention. "Purity of intention" means the purity of the motive with which things are done. We can do two acts equally well, and one of them may be of no value to us in Eternity, while the other may be of very great value, because of the purity

vi. Powers. of the intention with which we did it. The Powers are those who are possessed of the grace of benignity, that is gentleness, kindness.

3. Third Hierarchy. vii. Virtues. The Third Hierarchy consists of Virtues, Archangels and Angels. The Virtues are thought to be those Angels who are especially helpful in healing. The

Archangels are remarkable for their service of light and instruction in the Divine Law, and are especially GOD'S Messengers. It was the Archangel Gabriel who first said the "Hail Mary" when on the Feast of the Annunciation he brought to S. Mary the message that she should be the instrument of the Incarnation; and we read in the book of Daniel of the Archangel Michael coming to the Jews in their captivity. The third order, that of the Angels, is the lowest of all. They are simply GOD'S Messengers, who do His Will in the world.

viii. Archangels.

ix. Angels.

Through all these orders GOD works mediately, first in moving and ruling earthly and heavenly bodies, then in protecting kingdoms, and lastly in guarding each particular soul.

Through Angels GOD works mediately.

Passing over the question of the relation of the Angels to matter and to the government of the material world, we may notice lastly the important part they play in our lives, as our guardian Angels. It is the unanimous teaching of all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church that at least from Baptism each individual soul has a guardian Angel, and that probably the same privilege extends to all men from birth to death. This is founded especially on S. Matt., xviii. 10, and Heb. i. 14. There is also a prevalent opinion, though not so general, that not only individuals but Churches, nations, and other communities are under the guardianship of Angels; and that S. Michael the Archangel is the guardian of the Catholic Church, as of old he was of GOD'S people the Jews. This is chiefly founded on the tenth chapter of Daniel.

Guardian Angels.

There is no consensus of opinion concerning the question whether the Angels were created in a state of nature and afterwards raised to a state of grace, or were

In what state were the Angels created?

originally created in a state of grace. Nor is it certain how long a time elapsed between their creation and the moment of their trial.

III. Their Trial.

The Angels probably did not see GOD face to face until after their trial, and then, of course, only those who by that trial were perfected. It seems at first sight difficult to conceive the possibility of evil in beings who were created perfect, who were endowed with supernatural grace, who lived in the *light* of GOD'S Presence, and who had no evil within their nature and no tempter from without; but we must remember that they were outside GOD, and that as in Him is all goodness, there is always outside GOD a possibility of evil. Again, the gift of free will with which they were endowed involved the power of choice, and this in its turn necessitated the possibility of the choice of evil.

In what it consisted.

What their trial was we do not know, although all theologians agree that their fall was caused by pride, and the Bible in more than one place intimates this (Isaiah, xiv. 12, etc., Ecclus. x. 14), and that this pride consisted in an inordinate desire to be like GOD—"I will be like the Most High," is what Lucifer, the leader of the rebel Angels, is represented as saying in the description of his fall given under the imagery of the King of Babylon in the fourteenth chapter of Isaiah. The three chief views found among theologians are, first, that Lucifer desired to be a deity like and equal to GOD; this, however, seems to be inconsistent with the intelligence of the Angels, who must have realized its impossibility. Secondly, that he desired power and subjects and empire to rule, not as GOD'S minister, but of his own right and subject to no one else; that it was GOD'S attribute of Sovereignty which he especially coveted; and to this view S. Augustine,

Three Views. That Lucifer desired 1. To be like GOD.

2. To be a Sovereign.

S. Thomas, S. Bonaventura and others incline. Lastly, the view of Suarez, which since his day has gained considerable ground among theologians, is that, knowing something of the Incarnation, Lucifer desired that the Hypostatic Union should be formed in his person, and this not taking place he raised the banner of revolt.

3. To be the Instrument of the Incarnation.

Most theologians and Fathers think that his fall had something to do with GOD'S revelation to him of the Mystery of the Incarnation. S. Bernard expressly says that "it was from envy and grief because of this knowledge that he felt that he would not bow the knee to dust and ashes such as the pure Body of CHRIST was."

The result of the sin of the Angels was war in heaven (Rev. xii. 7), although by "heaven" we must here understand not the Beatific Vision, for none of the Angels saw GOD until after their trial, but the Empyrean. In reply to Lucifer's challenge, "I will be like GOD," S. Michael, leader of the hosts of Heaven, raised the banner which his name indicates, "Who is like GOD?" The conflict seems to have been intellectual, and its result was that the devil "was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him" (Rev. xii. 9).

The result of the sin of the Angels.

After this trial the Angels who followed Michael, and who seem to have comprehended two thirds of the host of Heaven, were admitted to the Vision of GOD, while man was created to carry on the warfare with the evil angels until the Last Day, when they shall be cast out of the earth into the bottomless pit.

Holy Angels admitted to the Vision of GOD.

The majority of theologians have thought that the intrinsic nature of Angels was such that there could be no place of repentance for those who fell. But many theologians, including Suarez, hold that even they had

Could the fallen Angels repent?

sufficient grace given them and time to repent, but that they would not. No theologian, however, holds that they had efficient grace of repentance given them (that is, grace which actually effects its purpose).

Some from each order fell.

It seems probable from various texts of Scripture that some Angels from each order fell, and as it is the general opinion of theologians that man was created to fill the places of the fallen angels, it is probable that some men will be raised to positions in each order.

Man created to fill their places.

CHAPTER III.

THE CREATION AND FALL OF MAN.

Introductory.

AFTER the fall of the angels man was created to fill the thrones which their sin left vacant in heaven. We have already observed that the catastrophe alluded to in the second verse of Genesis, where we are told the earth became waste and desolate ("without form and void"), is by many of the fathers of the Church connected with the fall of the rebel angels. It is believed that the devil endeavoured to wreak his malice upon this earth as the only creature of GOD then within his reach, and that he caused the chaotic condition which is revealed by this verse as well as by the discoveries of geology. But GOD out of the evil brought good, and after restoring step by step the ruined world, as the first chapter of Genesis and the science of geology teach us, at last created man, the flower and crown of the material world, and the link between heaven and earth.

Man created to fill the places of the fallen Angels,

whose malice had wrecked the primeval earth.

Its Restoration.

I. Human Nature as created by GOD.

It is of importance that we should clearly understand what human nature was as originally created by GOD, and what it became through the Fall, in order that we may grasp its present condition and its future possibilities.

In GOD'S Image.

Man, we are told, was created by GOD in His own image (Gen. i. 27). The word "bara" implies a

real creative act as regards his *soul*, but the other account in Gen. ii. 7 shows that his *body* was not "created," in the strict sense of having been produced apart from pre-existing matter. GOD used existing matter from which to fashion man's body, into which He then breathed "the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Whether this matter was prepared mediately through the process of evolution, or immediately at the moment of his creation, neither the Bible nor the Church tells us. But that the immaterial part of man was then created both the use of the word "create" in Genesis and the teaching of the Church assure us.

Dichotomy and Trichotomy.

The majority of theologians in the past have recognized in man simply a twofold nature, material and spiritual, body and soul. This division undoubtedly avoids many difficult questions which arise when we attempt to make the threefold division of body, soul, and spirit which S. Paul speaks of in his Epistles. Concerning the first member of the division there is no difference of opinion, man's material body being recognized by all as the flower and crown of the lower creation, every kingdom of which is represented in it. But when we treat of the immaterial part of man the dichotomists practically regard "soul" and "spirit" as synonymous terms describing the whole of the immaterial man; while the trichotomists, following S. Paul, *subdivide* this immaterial part into soul and spirit, considering the *soul* as the sensitive faculties and the *spirit* as the rational and moral faculties.

Trichotomy has been gaining ground during the present century, and has much to recommend it since it explains many expressions of S. Paul in regard to soul and spirit and to the struggle between flesh and

spirit, which dichotomy practically ignores. But though the threefold division of body, soul, and spirit was taught in the early Church by Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Didymus of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, and Basil of Cæsarea, and theoretically admitted by St. Augustine, yet, for a thousand years it dropped out of the Church's teaching. It cannot now claim the authority of any Catholic theologians of note, and has never been the opinion of the undivided Church. Its discussion, therefore, although interesting, is foreign to the purpose of this work.

The soul of man.

The immaterial, or spiritual, part of man may be considered as a substance endowed with special faculties, such as intellect, free will, etc., and in its own nature independent of the conditions of space to which matter is subject. Being a substance, it is capable of existing apart from the body, and will so exist in Purgatory or Heaven until the Last Day. During life it is united to the body so as to be present wholly in the body and wholly in each part of the body, according to the mode of presence in space which is proper to created spirits.

The soul immortal.

Three ways in which a being may be immortal.

The soul of man is immortal. There are three ways in which a being may be immortal. (1) Life may be his by the necessity of his nature, as is the case with God alone ; or (2) his nature may be such as to have no inherent tendency to death, so that it will not die unless God withdraws His conservation, as is the case with the soul of man ; or (3) there may be an inherent tendency to death, which, however, is hindered from taking effect by an interposition of God's providence, as was the case with Adam in respect to his body before the Fall.

Endowed with a spiritual nature, man is not only a

Man not only rational but religious.

rational being, he is also capable of religion; and in this capacity for religion, even more than in the possession of reason, he differs altogether from the rest of creation. Some have thought they could trace glimmerings of reason in the instinct of the higher animals, but no one has ever seen any signs of religion except in man, and this is the result of his peculiar possession of a spiritual nature.

Origin of the soul.

1. Traducianism.

2. Generationism.

3. Creationism.

Although in the early ages of the Church, Tertullian and some others held the theory of Traducianism,—that the soul of the child was in some manner derived from the *bodies* of the parents; and others held a somewhat similar theory, which goes by the name of Generationism,—that the child's soul was in some way the product of the *souls* of the parents; yet the Church has practically always taught the doctrine of Creationism,—that the human soul is created and infused into the body at the first moment that there is a body fit to receive it.

Man whether created in a state of nature or grace.

Man in the supernatural state.

It is a matter of opinion among theologians whether Adam was created in a state of nature, (or, as it is sometimes called, of innocence,) and afterwards raised to a supernatural state; or whether he was originally created in this supernatural state. Before the fifteenth century the former was probably the most common view, although it was not held by S. Thomas Aquinas. Since then his view has chiefly prevailed, namely, that Adam was created in the supernatural state of sanctifying grace, free from sin and all that follows from sin, sanctifying grace inhering in the soul and making him holy, just, and pleasing to GOD. With this went also freedom from concupiscence and from liability to pain and death, together with a high degree of knowledge infused by GOD into Adam at the moment of his creation.

II. Adam's trial.

In this state Adam was placed in the Garden of Eden,

surrounded by all that was needed to minister to his happiness and to enable him to serve GOD. Eden, however, was not to be his eternal home. Like the angels he was to be subjected to a trial before he could be translated to that heaven which is the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision. In this state of grace he enjoyed a very close communion with GOD, and was free to follow his desires with one exception. GOD in giving him permission to eat of the fruit of every tree of the garden imposed upon him one law of obedience, which was in fact a limitation of his intellectual nature. He must restrain himself from eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Adam's knowledge.

Adam had a very great knowledge of creatures, infused by GOD, and probably an increasing knowledge of GOD, derived from GOD'S own communication or revelation of Himself when Adam "heard the voice of the LORD GOD walking in the garden in the cool of the day."

The Tempter appealed to the passion of curiosity by

He had doubtless that passion of curiosity, which, while it is so great a gift of GOD, and the incentive to all knowledge, yet from the first has needed discipline and restraint. It was to this passion that the tempter appealed when, manifesting himself to Eve under the appearance of a serpent, he first suggested a doubt concerning the fact of GOD'S command by his question, "Yea, *hath* GOD said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"—and then denied the truth of the further revelation of the consequences of disobedience when he said, "Ye shall *not surely* die." Having thus striven to remove the fear of the consequences of sin, he went on to arouse both curiosity and desire by promising a great reward,—"in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

1. A doubt about a truth of Revelation.

2. The denial of a truth of Revelation.

3. Removing the fear of consequences of sin.

4. Promising a great reward.

Adam's temptation a type of all temptation.

Temptation analyzed.

Some have spoken of this temptation as though it were a mere childish story. Yet how true it is to man's experience always! For what is temptation but a struggle between desire and law? Temptation is intense in proportion to the strength of the desire; the violation will be great in proportion to the strictness of the law. It matters little what sin we take; the steps of temptation are generally much the same; first, a doubt suggested about the fact of the commandment or law; then a minimizing or denial of the consequences of its violation, and then an immense exaggeration of the pleasure or reward which will follow from the sin.

Adam restricted only by intellectual discipline.

Our first parents' knowledge though great was limited. The passion of curiosity was really the only passion which had to be restrained. As for their bodies, they could eat of any tree of the garden which they desired; for their souls there was the tree of life; but for their *intellect* there was the restriction "Of the tree of the knowledge of good *and evil*, thou shalt *not* eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The Temptation appealed to the intellect,

How truly, how lovingly GOD warns us of the consequences of sin! How falsely, how maliciously Satan strives to deceive us about these consequences! He promised Eve, "In the day ye eat thereof ye shall be as gods." Lucifer's own temptation, as S. Bernard observes, was the desire to be as GOD. He said, "I will be like GOD," when he raised the standard of revolt against GOD. Lucifer desired to be like GOD in power, and so by GOD'S power he was hurled from his place in Heaven. Adam and Eve, yielding to the temptation, desired to be like GOD in knowledge, and they were driven out of Eden. Man can never without presumption covet to be like GOD in these attri-

as S. Bernard shows.

butes; but there is one in which man may, in which man must strive to be godlike—in love; for "GOD is Love," and GOD has given to man as the first commandment, "Thou shalt love the LORD thy GOD with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind"; and as the second, which is like unto it, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

Three steps in the Temptation.

In the temptation of Eve we see not only the three steps by which Satan seduced her but the three steps by which she gradually yielded, "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" (1 S. John ii. 16). "When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat."

Undisciplined desire of the intellect the chief temptation even now.

It was by yielding to undisciplined desire of the intellect that the barriers were broken down and the soul was flooded with the filth of all subsequent sin. Is it not often so now? In yielding to unbridled pride of the intellect, to undisciplined curiosity, men and women read the immoral literature of the day and rise up from it with the poison of every sort of sin coursing through their veins, throbbing in their nature, and making it a thousand times more difficult to live lives of purity and holiness.

III. The consequences of Adam's sin.

All sin is disobedience to the law of GOD. Adam sinned, and what was the result? Let us endeavour clearly to understand the consequences of Adam's sin, without exaggerating it as Protestant writers do. The doctrine of the total depravity of man as the result of the Fall, so dear to the Protestant mind, is as gross an exaggeration as the Pelagian teaching that man of his own will and strength, unaided by GOD'S grace, can

Total depravity an exaggeration on the one side as Pelagianism is on the other.

The chief result was discord in man's nature.

live a righteous life. The result of the Fall was the introduction of discord into that human nature where all before had been harmony. Passions good in themselves were put in conflict with other passions, producing that state of warfare so often described in S. Paul's Epistles. We must bear in mind that nothing was introduced into man's nature by the fall which was not there before. It was rather as though in some mighty piece of machinery a little pin had snapped, and the great limb of the machine, which had been doing such splendid work, had been set free, and had whirled round and round bringing ruin and devastation to everything within its reach.

We are now in a position to consider exactly the effects of the Fall and the present condition of man.

Before the Fall man possessed 1. Sanctifying grace.

Before the Fall man possessed the *supernatural* gift of sanctifying grace, or original righteousness, by which all that he did was pleasing to GOD and merited eternal life, together with the clear vision of GOD, which belongs naturally to no creature; and certain

2. Præternatural gifts.

præternatural gifts, such as a very great knowledge of creatures, and an "integrity" of his nature which gave him freedom from concupiscence, together with the gift of immortality.

Explanation of terms used.

Here perhaps we should explain some of the terms used. "Natural" strictly speaking means that with

Natural.

which a man is born (*nascor*) as opposed to what is acquired; but it is used also in another sense as that which belongs to an individual because he belongs to a cer-

Præternatural.

tain species. "Præternatural" is that which is not required by the nature, but does not transcend the order of that nature. It perfects the nature within its own limits without raising it to a higher order. Freedom from concupiscence, for example, is præter-

natural. "Supernatural" implies that which is superadded to the natural, and in theology means what is above the essence and requirements of any created nature. "Concupiscence" is the same as our ordinary word "desire," and signifies the yearning of the soul for some good or fancied good which it does not possess. The word itself does not indicate whether the object of the desire is good or bad, nor whether the desire originates in the soul or in the body.

Supernatural.

Concupiscence.

Now, the desires which a man forms *may* originate in an act of his free will; but, though this origination is possible, it is not usual. It ordinarily happens that the *suggestion* to form the desire comes from that part of the man's nature to which the desired act is suitable, whether it be body or soul. These suggestions in theology have the name of "first motions," which term includes affections of the soul, as well as bodily movements. These first motions are not under the control of the will, which is the highest faculty of the rational soul, but the will is able to resist them as soon as they are fully perceived. And when first motions of a particular character, whether good or bad, are habitually crushed at their first occurrence, they gradually cease to show themselves.

First motions.

But further, every man finds not only that first motions arise within him, but that they are not easy to control. He may will to reject them but may find himself unable to do so. They persist, and a state of disturbance is set up within him which may be described as a conflict. Not that there are *two* antagonistic wills contending for the mastery, but that the one will is drawn this way and that by these first motions. The free will is always master, and can assert itself; but this self-assertion sometimes involves a struggle, which

The moral struggle.

Not two wills conflicting, but the will and first motions.

Struggle traced to opposite causes.

may be long and painful. This struggle of the soul may come from a determination when a man is bent upon some sin, not to listen to the promptings of divine grace, or it may be the very opposite, when the struggle consists in the state of temptation to sin; and this phase of our nature is what is peculiarly known as "concupiscence."

Integrity.

A clear grasp of the meaning of the word "concupiscence" will enable us to understand the sense in which "integrity" is used. It means freedom from concupiscence. Before the Fall the whole nature of our first parents was under the control of their rational will, which had no trouble in disposing of all suggestions that came to it, either accepting or rejecting, and the suggestion at once came to an end. They were not exempt from temptation, as we know; but their temptation consisted merely in a forbidden good being presented to their minds. There was no struggle in them such as we constantly understand by "temptation."

Concupiscence not Sin.

From this we shall see that concupiscence is not in itself sin. For sin essentially requires the consent of the will to evil. In the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans the word sin is used many times in the sense of concupiscence, but it is used thus loosely not because concupiscence is truly and properly sin in the regenerate man, but because it springs from sin and inclines to sin. So S. James says, "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." Here it is evident that "lust," or concupiscence, is not the same as sin, for that which "conceives and brings forth" is not the same as that which is brought forth, and S. James tells us that it conceives and brings forth sin.

From the understanding of these terms we shall be better able to see clearly the effects of the Fall. By the Fall man lost all supernatural grace and those præternatural gifts with which GOD had endowed him, although the Divine decree immediately went forth that in virtue of the redemption to be wrought by the Word Made Flesh, the race should be restored to the supernatural destiny it had lost. But the supernatural gift of sanctifying grace was not given back to the race as a whole. It was to be given only to individuals on the fulfilment of certain conditions.

What man lost by the Fall.

1. All supernatural grace.
2. And præternatural gifts.

From the Fall came "original sin," by which we mean that man is born in a state of privation of something which ought to have been his—this privation having its origin in the actual sin of our first parents. Further, there is that *tendency* to evil which arises from a weakened will unable to resist the first motions of concupiscence, human nature having lost by the Fall the gift of "integrity."

Original sin a privation of gifts,

and a tendency to evil from the loss of integrity.

Yet at the same time, by the Fall man did not lose the image of GOD, nor did it render the soul substantially bad or completely depraved, for the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity in the Incarnation took on Him a nature substantially the same as ours, and certainly He assumed nothing that was substantially bad.

Image of GOD not lost.

We shall see this more clearly, perhaps, if we point out the two chief errors which have arisen in regard to the fall—Pelagianism and Lutheranism.

IV. Two chief errors in regard to the Fall.

The Pelagians taught that Adam was mortal and would have died even if he had not sinned, and that his sin did harm to himself alone and not to his posterity; that children are now born in the state in which Adam was *before* his sin; that man is able by his own *unaided* will to work out his salvation. They were

1. Pelagianism.

succeeded by the Semi-Pelagians, who did not deny the necessity of grace to enable a man to work out his salvation, but taught that free will sufficed for the *first step* towards good, and that by this first step man *earned* the grace which was needed for further progress. Pelagianism, by making man's own will without GOD'S grace sufficient for the working out of his salvation, practically deprives the work of CHRIST of all real efficacy.

2. Lutheranism.

Lutheranism falls into the other extreme. It teaches that the freedom of the will was lost by the Fall, so that man is now intrinsically corrupt and incapable of doing any act which is in any sense good.

Catholic view.

The Catholic doctrine, as we have seen, is that original sin is the loss of original righteousness, or sanctifying grace; the loss of præternatural gifts being a punishment of original sin rather than original sin itself.

Science blind to a Fall.

It is not an uncommon thing to read in rationalistic books that science sees no signs of a fall in man's history, but only of continuous progress both in the amelioration of his physical wealth and the development of his intellectual life. The answer is that the effects of the Fall are to be found in man's *moral* life, and only in a secondary degree in his physical and intellectual life; and that though undoubtedly man has made some progress even in his moral life, yet it has been but fitful and uncertain and confined to individuals.

Yet the only explanation of moral struggle.

Heredity explains original sin.

The scientific doctrine of heredity largely explains the results of original sin. The fact that man alone among all the animate creatures does not pursue what he knows to be his true end, is absolutely inexplicable without the doctrine of a fall and original sin. Where can we find any animal which acts as man often does

when he persists in doing those things which his intellect tells him are injurious? as when the drunkard persists in drinking, though his intellect tells him not only of the immediate suffering which will follow his drunken bout, but that it is ruining every part of his nature, intellectual, moral, and physical. Instances like this, which are so terribly frequent among men, seem scientifically to demand the doctrine of a fall as the explanation of man's moral weakness.

Drunkenness and kindred habits scientifically demand a "Fall."

CHAPTER IV.

THE INCARNATION.

Introductory.

HAVING now gained some knowledge of the nature of GOD, of the history of creation, and of the nature of man both before and after his fall, we are prepared to consider that doctrine which is the very keystone of the Christian religion—the doctrine of the Incarnation. It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of gaining a really clear and complete grasp of the Incarnation, for on it almost all Christianity rests, and from it nearly all the doctrines of the Church flow.

The Incarnation the keystone of Christianity.

Yet often but imperfectly understood.

The Revelation of GOD,

and of man.

And yet there is a large number of Christians who have but a very imperfect and elementary idea of what is meant by the Incarnation. It is to us the great revelation of GOD, for in CHRIST "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii. 9). But the Incarnation is also the great revelation of man, of his strength, of his possibilities for good—man as GOD made him and meant him to be. For in fallen man we are only able to study human nature marred and distorted by sin, which is an element foreign to man as GOD purposed him to be. In studying any intricate piece of machinery it is an immense help at the start if we know the purpose for which it was made. The Incarnation reveals to man the purpose for which he was created,

The Incarnation reveals the end and purpose of man's creation.

the goal for which he must aim, and the perfection to which he must attain.

The most concise statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation is contained in the fourteenth verse of the first chapter of the Gospel of S. John :—"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." The whole of his Gospel and Epistles is but an amplification of this text.

Article II.

This truth is theologically set forth in the second Article of Religion as follows: "The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal GOD, and of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance : so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very GOD and very Man."

I. Why did the Incarnation take place?

But before we proceed to the theological consideration of this great doctrine a most interesting and important question has to be answered. Why did the Incarnation take place? Was it merely the remedy for man's sin, or was it part of GOD'S original purpose in creating? that is, would it have taken place if Adam had not sinned?

These questions have been discussed among theologians from the very beginning. S. Thomas takes the first view—that the Incarnation was the remedy for sin, and therefore, considering all the blessings which it brought with it, he speaks of Adam's fall as "felix culpa." He has on his side many great names, belonging to almost all schools of theology—his friend S. Bonaventure, Cajetan, Petavius, etc.

Thomist view.

Scotist view.

The other view, that the Incarnation would have

taken place if man had never fallen, is upheld by Duns Scotus, S. Bernard, S. Francis de Sales, Suarez, etc. These think it unseemly that the greatest work of GOD should have been done as the result of the sin of the creature, and they find in Scripture many indications that the honour of GOD INCARNATE is the real end of all creation (Prov. viii. 22; Col. i. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 7). And they see in the predestination of CHRIST the basis of our predestination (Eph. i. 4, 5; 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23).

While the Thomist view was the more prevalent in the past, the Scotist is probably the one which is held by most theologians of the present day, not only for the reasons we have mentioned, but because it gives such a consistent explanation of all GOD's work in creation and redemption. Let us, therefore, spend a little time in considering the Incarnation more fully from this point of view.

Scotist view examined.

Briefly we may put the opinion of Scotist theologians somewhat as follows: When GOD in His infinite love willed to create, He created all things for a perfect end; this indeed His attribute of Omnipotence demands. But this ultimate perfection was to be attained by a law of *progress*, the stages of which may be read in the annals of the universe. Confining ourselves as we must to our own planet, we may perhaps for convenience' sake group the stages of this progress into four great epochs or chapters: the development of inorganic matter till it was fitted to receive and sustain organic life; the development of this organic life until man appeared; commencing with man, the unfolding and growth of moral life till it culminated in the Incarnation; the introduction and operation of Divine life in man through the Incarnation.

All things created for a perfect end.

A law of progress.

Four epochs of this progress in our planet.
1. Development of inorganic matter.
2. Of organic life.
3. Of moral life.
4. Of Divine life.

Creation the act of GOD'S Antecedent Will.

It has been said that all creation is a ladder by which we may climb up into the Heart of GOD and see there His love for us. This is also true when regarded from a different point of view, for that creation which came forth from GOD by the fiat of His Will, progressed step by step until in the Incarnation it returned to Him again. In GOD'S original purpose (or, as S. John Damascene calls it, His Antecedent Will), He willed everything to march steadily forward step by step to perfection. Thus the material universe found its crown and flower, its true representative in man who, created in the image of GOD, was to be the instrument of GOD'S supreme act of love in the Incarnation. Man by his body summed up all the lower kingdoms of creation; by the spiritual nature which he shared with the angels he was linked to GOD; and through the operation of the HOLY SPIRIT he held close communion with GOD. And had man not fallen, he would have progressed according to GOD'S purpose by the aid of sanctifying grace until he reached such a state of perfection that the Divine Word could have become Incarnate; and this would have been the climax of GOD'S purpose for man.

The material world found its climax in man,

and by the Incarnation was to be taken with man into GOD

without suffering and death.

The Incarnation then, without suffering or death, would have been the taking of man, and in him of all creation, into GOD; not by any pantheistic mode of absorption, but by the fulfilment of GOD'S original purpose, by which the creature should attain its ultimate perfection in CHRIST, to the glory of GOD, and to its own exceeding and eternal beatitude. The Incarnation would have been the last act in the great drama, the addition of the capping stone to the great structure, the realization of the great ideal; for in the Word GOD saw all creation ideally perfect (Col. i. 16, 17).

Geology a record of progress.

We read the history of the earlier chapters of GOD'S work in the science of geology, the record of the marvellous progress of our globe. We see the development of the creature through the various kingdoms of mineral, vegetable, and animal life, culminating in man, in whom we see a new departure, a new creation, the introduction of a conscious moral life. That progress would have gone on in a wonderful development of moral life, so far as we know, but for two catastrophes or interruptions which led to some modifications (if one may use the term) of the original march of progress. These two interruptions were the fall of the angels and the fall of man, by which sin was introduced into the world.

Two catastrophes which led to a modification of the original plan.

Sin: its meaning, and result.

Sin, as the translation of *chattath*, or *ἁμαρτία*, means "missing the mark." It resulted necessarily in confusion, disorder and the loss of that communion with GOD which our first parents had. For while in one sense the whole creation, material and spiritual, was outside GOD before the Incarnation (which was therefore as necessary for the angels as for man), yet when GOD created man in His own image a very close communion between GOD and man existed through the operation of the HOLY SPIRIT. This communion was lost by the Fall; and disorder and confusion then took the place of harmony and peace.

The remedy for the Fall provided by GOD'S Consequent Will.

Man a moral being.

While the Fall was no part of GOD'S original purpose, or Antecedent Will, it was present to GOD'S foreknowledge as a possibility, and was provided for by His Consequent Will. When He willed to create moral beings with the power of choice, so that they might love GOD and choose good, there was of necessity the possibility of evil. Without this power of choice, without this possibility of evil we

might do good, but we could not love good; we might be excellent machines, we could not be moral agents.

The two trees in Eden.

So we are told that before the Fall, in the time of man's innocency, there were in the Garden of Eden two trees, the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The tree of life represented the fellowship and communion with GOD which was to be at once man's joy and the means of his progress. The tree of knowledge represented that knowledge of evil which is necessary in order that we may deliberately honour GOD by choosing good, by choosing Him. In order that we may so choose the good, evil must be present as a thing possible to us; but to be known and contemplated only as GOD knows and contemplates it, present that it may be recognized, hated, but never experienced.

Evil as a possibility necessary to a moral choice.

Adam, however, was not satisfied thus to contemplate evil and to hate it; he wished to taste it—to experience it. In a word, by his own deliberate act he chose evil, and he fell, and in his experience of evil he lost the fruit of that other tree, the tree of life, whose fruit bestowed upon man the power of communion with GOD. And so man's nature lost its sustaining power and collapsed. The Fall introduced nothing new into human nature; but it caused the withdrawal of GOD'S fellowship with man and the loss of the continual operation of the HOLY SPIRIT. And this resulted in a condition of disorder and struggle between the various powers of man's nature which before had been harmoniously balanced.

Collapse of man's nature at the Fall.

After the Fall a new preparation for the Incarnation.

In consequence of the Fall a new preparation for the Incarnation became necessary, and began in the education and development of the human race, one particular nation being trained by type, prophecy, theophany,

In Judaism.

worship and legislation to be the instrument for the accomplishment of GOD'S loving purpose.

And everywhere.

But our view would be very partial if we limited this preparation to Judaism. Everywhere it was going on, in the natural theology as well as in the art and science, the literature and civilization of the various races of the world. For as S. John says, the Word was "the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world"; and the Eastern mystics, the astronomers of Chaldæa and the priests of Egypt alike were learning, though with difficulty, to spell out GOD'S revelation in nature.

Eastern mystics, Chaldean and Egyptian sages,

Greeks and Romans all helped to prepare for CHRIST.

Greek philosophy and art and literature, Roman polity and commerce alike were preparing the world by GOD'S Providence for the revelation of the Incarnate Word. The Greeks were not only to supply the most perfect language the world has ever known, wherein to enshrine His revelation, but they were also to train men's minds to receive and apply it. For we must remember that the great Fathers of the Church, such as Clement and Origen, Athanasius and Augustine, Gregory and Basil, were thoroughly familiar with Greek philosophy, and testified to what it had done for their souls in preparing them to receive and afterwards to teach the religion of the Incarnation.

Roman roads.

Even those splendid Roman roads, which are still memorials of the energy and thoroughness of that great nation and along which its commerce went forth through the world, were themselves the literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah xl. 3, "Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a *highway* for our GOD"; for they were trodden by the feet of Apostles and Missionaries bearing the Gospel of the Incarnation to the ends of the earth.

Parallelisms with Christianity.

The very fact which has been suggested by some sceptics as a difficulty,—that there are parallelisms and resemblances between the moral precepts of some earlier religions and the Sermon on the Mount (though the former are but faint shadows of that great reality),—so far from being a difficulty to the believer in the Incarnation, is but a proof of the truth of S. Paul's words that among the nations the living GOD "left not Himself without witness." And those adumbrations of Christian doctrine, practice and ritual which may be traced with more or less distinctness in almost every ancient system of religion are the very things to which the theologian of the Incarnation points as a proof that *all* human nature was being trained to receive the Gospel of the Incarnation—that the Word was indeed "the Light of the world."

Justin Martyr, the first Christian apologist, claims Socrates and Heraclitus, with all the enlightened heathen, as virtually Christians because illuminated by the true Light.

So we recognize and claim every advance towards truth, even when mingled with error, as the work of the Divine Word in the world, illumining human reason, inspiring some with a thirst for holiness, others with intellectual eagerness after truth, and preparing all for the revelation of the Incarnation.

But after the fall of man it was impossible for the Incarnation to be, as but for sin it would have been, the *first* step in a perfected humanity by which man would have been translated, so to speak, into heaven itself.

Instead of the last step in the Gospel of Creation the

Instead of the Incarnation being the last act in the Gospel of Creation, it became the foundation of a further Gospel of Redemption. This was rendered necessary by the fact that on account of sin the progress of

Incarnation became the first in the Gospel of Redemption.

humanity had practically come to a standstill, and the bitter experience of the race had brought home to human consciousness the conviction that man was powerless to help himself, and that without GOD'S intervention and aid he could advance no further towards the goal of perfection. The Incarnation then became

By it was restored what had been lost by the Fall.

(in addition to its original purpose of taking man and in him all creation into GOD) also the means by which the supernatural gift lost by the Fall was restored. Divine Life was introduced and imparted to man to aid his weakened moral life; and the arrested progress recommenced, though still fettered by the results of sin. The Incarnation as modified by sin led necessarily to the Atonement, a superinduced result of a cause not originally present, namely, sin.

Such is the Scotist view of the purpose of the Incarnation.

II. The Incarnation as a Fact. Definition.

Now let us turn to the Incarnation as a fact, and strive to grasp accurately the Church's teaching about it.

The Incarnation was the taking of manhood into GOD, not by a fusion of the human and Divine natures, but by the uniting of both (while each nature was kept perfectly distinct) in the One Person of the Word, the Eternal SON of GOD, the Second Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity.

The means.

The means by which this was accomplished was the operation of the HOLY GHOST upon the substance of the Blessed Virgin Mary, by which act the Word became the Son of Man without being the Son of *a* man, and so took into Himself humanity without taking Adam's taint of original sin. This virgin birth is not only an article of faith in the Church; but it also commends itself to our reason as the only way, so far as we can see, in which the purpose of the Incarnation

The Virgin Birth.

could be accomplished and humanity taken into GOD apart from the taint of sin. And so the Creed tells us that our LORD was made "Man," not "a man." It was manhood, not a man,—human *nature*, not a human *person*, that the SON of GOD took into union with Himself; and it is of the utmost importance to any clear understanding of the Incarnation to grasp this.

Human nature and human personality.

By human "nature" we mean all those qualities which the race has in common; by a human "person" we mean a separate individual, possessing that distinct and sovereign power of action in the soul to which we give the name of "personality." Now Adam did not transmit to his descendants his own personality, for that is incommunicable, but his nature. No human being can part with his own personality, or share it with another. When Adam begat sons and daughters he passed on to his offspring his own nature, but his personality remained exclusively his own for ever, and his descendants had each their own personality.

Why the Word took impersonal human nature.

Personality, then, is no essential part of human nature, but human nature is organized on a new personality in every individual. It is therefore not so difficult to understand that in order to cut off the entail of that tainted *moral* nature which we derive from Adam, and to make the Hypostatic Union of the Divine and human natures possible, the germ of humanity which was derived from Adam through the Blessed Virgin was vitalized by the direct operation of the HOLY GHOST, the LORD and Life-Giver. Moreover, instead of being, as it is with us, united to a new human personality, *that* human nature was taken up into the Personality of the Word. Thus all that was essential to humanity was taken up by the Second Adam, and

the differences between our LORD'S Humanity and ours,—that He had no human *father*, no human *person*, and no *sin*,—are none of them differences which touch in any way the integrity and perfection of His Human Nature.

Four heresies in regard to the Incarnation refuted by Councils.

Concerning the fact of the Incarnation in the early ages of the Church four false propositions arose and took shape as definite heresies. They were condemned after thorough examination by the first four General Councils, the opposite truth in each case being defined authoritatively by the Church.

1. Arianism, by Nicæa.

First, there was the Arian heresy, which, denying the truth that CHRIST was really GOD, attacked the perfection of His Divine Nature. This was refuted by the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, which defined His Divine Nature in the Creed (which bears its name) by declaring Him to be ὁμοούσιος, "of the same substance" as the FATHER.

2. Apollinarianism, by Constantinople.

Then came a reaction, and Apollinarius, while accepting the Nicene decree respecting the Divine Nature of our LORD, went to the other extreme and denied the reality and perfection of His Humanity by asserting that He had no human soul or νοῦς, its place being, as he held, supplied by the Divine Person of the Word. Thus he really denied the πνεῦμα in man's trichotomy. Now this was taking away from the integrity of our LORD'S *Human* Nature, since a human or rational soul is an essential part of humanity, and is indeed that which differentiates men alike from the angels and the brute creation. This heresy was condemned by the Second General Council, that of Constantinople, A.D. 381.

3. Nestorianism, by Ephesus.

Next there arose the heresy of Nestorius, who, while accepting the decrees of Nicæa and Constantinople con-

cerning the perfection of the two Natures of our LORD, taught that He had also two Personalities, a human personality as well as a Divine Personality, thus denying any real union between GOD and man in the Incarnation. This was condemned by the Third General Council, that of Ephesus, A.D. 431.

4. Eutychianism, by Chalcedon.

In his opposition to Nestorianism Eutyches taught that as there was but one Person, so there was also but one Nature in our LORD; and that this one nature was a sort of fusion of the Human and Divine in the formation of a third composite nature. This heresy was condemned by the Fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

The Catholic doctrine.

Hence the Catholic faith is that there are in our LORD two whole and perfect Natures, the Human and the Divine, distinct and yet united hypostatically in one Divine Personality in the Eternal Word, the SON of GOD.

There still remain some few points to be considered in connection with the doctrine of the Incarnation.

The HOLY GHOST the Agent in the Incarnation.

We have seen that the Incarnate SON of GOD is true Man, although He had no man for His father. The function that ordinarily falls to the father was in this one case performed by the direct action of GOD, Who can always produce by His own power whatever effects are the result of secondary causes. As Man, however, CHRIST was the Son of Mary, and His Body was nourished within her in exactly the same manner as in the ordinary process of gestation.

CHRIST the Son of Mary.

His Human Soul.

The Human Soul of CHRIST was created and infused into that Body at the first instant of its existence, and in the same instant the Divine Word assumed His Human Nature. It is of the utmost importance that we should realize the truth that from the first moment

CHRIST the SON of GOD.

of His Conception, the Holy Thing Which was conceived was the SON of GOD (S. Luke i. 35).

No Human Personality.

To hold otherwise would be to assert that for a certain period there was within the womb of Mary a man child having his own personality, which personality was in some way lost or destroyed when the nature was assumed by the Word; for it is of faith that there was but *one* Person in CHRIST. S. Fulgentius emphatically says, "Be most firm in your belief, and admit no doubt that the Flesh of CHRIST was not conceived in the womb of the Virgin before it was assumed by the Word."

III. Consequences of Human Nature being assumed by GOD.

It follows from this that the dignity to which Human Nature was raised, through its assumption by GOD, involved the consequence that CHRIST was Man from the first instant of Conception. From the first CHRIST was sanctified by grace, had the use of free will, was capable of merit, and enjoyed the clear vision of GOD. His Body grew as the bodies of other infants grow; but His Soul was not hampered in its operations by the imperfections of the Body which it informed. CHRIST'S human nature was in no sense subject to original sin, for this, by the Divine decree, is transmitted to those only who have for their father a child of Adam; and CHRIST had no human father. A higher reason for the sinlessness of CHRIST is found in the substantial union of the Humanity with the All-Holy GOD.

1. The actions of CHRIST.

Since the will is the principle from which the actions of a rational creature spring, it follows from the presence of two wills human and divine in CHRIST that His actions fall into three classes. First, His union with

i. Acts of the Divine Nature.

human nature did not prevent the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity from exercising all the powers of the

Divine Nature, including the Divine Will. The Divine Will in CHRIST was the Will which created the world and which unceasingly maintains creatures in existence and in the exercise of their powers (Col. i. 16, 17). Another class of the actions of CHRIST proceeds wholly from the Human Will, and proves that He was truly Man. To weep is to be purely human. The third class consists of those acts in which both wills had a part.

ii. Acts of the Human Nature

iii. Theandric acts.

We have examples of the last class of actions wherever our LORD was pleased to work His miracles by the use of some material instrument, as when He spread clay on the eyes of the man born blind and bade him to go and wash in the pool of Siloam (S. John, ix.). The clay and the washing could have had no efficacy apart from that which the Divine Will gave them; at the same time, it was in obedience to the Human Will that the Limbs moved to take the clay and apply it; here, then, we have an illustration of what may be termed theandric action. The healing of the centurion's servant, on the other hand, would come under the first class, where the Human Will had no direct physical part in the working of the miracle.

Definition of S. John Damascene.

S. John Damascene defines the theandric operation thus: "When GOD became Man, both His Human operation was Divine, to wit, deified, and it participated in His Divine operation; and His Divine operation participated in His Human operation; but either is contemplated in connection with the other. And this manner is styled 'periphrasis,' when a person embraces any two things by one expression. For as we call the divided cauterizing and the inflamed incision of the heated knife the same thing, and yet style the incision one operation and the cauterizing another, and call them operations of different natures, the cauteriz-

ing of fire and the incision of iron; so also, speaking of one theandric operation of CHRIST, we understand the operations of the two Natures to be two, the Divine that of His Divinity, and the Human Nature that of His Humanity."

2. The liberty of CHRIST.

Mankind was redeemed by the shedding of the Blood of CHRIST, but this blood-shedding would have had no merit had it not been freely offered. On the other hand, CHRIST speaks of having received a commandment from the FATHER to lay down His Life (S. John x. 18, and xiv. 31), and some might suppose that to one Who could not sin no freedom was left after He had received this commandment. S. Anselm meets the difficulty thus: "The FATHER did not give the Man CHRIST a precept compelling Him to die, but of His own accord He did that which He knew would please the FATHER and be profitable to men. . . . He rendered free obedience to the FATHER, but of His own accord He willed to do that which He knew would please the FATHER; and because this good Will, however free, was given Him by the FATHER, it is right to say that He received it as commanded by the FATHER."

3. The Hypostatic Union permanent.

We have already seen that the Human Nature of CHRIST was assumed by the Divine Word in the first instant of its existence. It is also the teaching of the Church that it was assumed for ever, for it never has been and never will be put off,—as we read, "JESUS CHRIST the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever" (Heb. xiii. 8).

The Dereliction.

When we read that on the Cross our LORD uttered the words, "My GOD, My GOD, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" we must remember that there was no dissolution of the substantial union of the two natures. The words form the first verse of the

twenty-second Psalm, and have been used by many a Christian labouring under a privation of the *sensible* Presence of GOD within him, though there has been no real change in his relation to GOD. Whatever difficulty there is in explaining the use of these words by CHRIST it is only a part of the wider mystery: how the suffering of the Passion was compatible with the Beatific Vision, which CHRIST was never without.

From the permanence of the Hypostatic Union it follows that between the Death of CHRIST and His Resurrection, while the Soul was separated from the Body (as happens at the death of every man) the Divinity remained ever united both to the Soul and to the Body of CHRIST.

4. The knowledge of CHRIST.

CHRIST as Man, from the first moment of His existence, enjoyed the Beatific Vision, by which He saw GOD as He is. This follows from the substantial union between the two natures, and from the dignity of true SON of GOD enjoyed by CHRIST as Man. Moreover we are taught that CHRIST as Man, in virtue of the union with the Godhead, had every divine perfection which was not incompatible with His state, and especially that His Human Intellect was perfected by the fulness of the knowledge which is called "infused," that is, knowledge which is not acquired gradually by experience, but is poured into the soul by God.

The Scriptures clearly teach that He had such knowledge, for on Him rests the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding (Isa. xi. 2), and to Him "GOD giveth not the SPIRIT by measure" (S. John iii. 34).

While this infused knowledge by its very nature did not admit of increase, there was also in CHRIST *acquired* knowledge gathered by the natural use of His faculties. It is of this that S. Luke speaks when he tells us that

"JESUS *increased in wisdom* and stature, and in favour with GOD and man" (S. Luke ii. 52). The increase was in knowledge acquired experimentally or by the use of His human faculties, as distinguished from the "infused" knowledge of which we have spoken.

His economic Ignorance.

Some persons have found difficulty in the words spoken by our LORD in regard to the Day of Judgment: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the SON, but the FATHER" (S. Mark xiii. 32). S. Jerome thinks that CHRIST here speaks in the character of Head of the Church, to whom no revelation is given concerning things which, however interesting, are not necessary for her work. But we may remember that our LORD Himself explicitly says: "I do nothing of Myself; but as My FATHER hath taught Me, I speak these things"; (S. John viii. 28), and again, "I speak that which I have seen with My FATHER" (ver. 38); and we may consider that the time of the Day of Judgment was not one of those things which the FATHER had shown or taught our LORD—and therefore not one of those which He knew—as the Son of Man.

5. Communicatio Idiomatum.

As there is a circuminsession in the Blessed Trinity, so in the Person of the Incarnate Word we perceive something similar which we call the "Communicatio Idiomatum," that is, the communication of *idioms*, properties or characteristics. Under this head theologians have decided certain rules of language, which must be carefully observed by those who wish to speak with accuracy on the Doctrine of the Incarnation. Such concrete names as "GOD" and "Man," "SON of GOD" and "Son of Man" denote the Divine or Human Nature as borne by the Person of the Word,

and not the Nature alone; but abstract words such as "Godhead" and "Manhood" denote the Natures themselves.

From this it follows that concrete words referring to either nature may be used whenever the subject spoken of is the Person of CHRIST, so that we may say of the Son of Mary that He is GOD or that He is Man, indifferently; but we must not say that the Humanity is GOD, or that the Divinity was born. We may say that GOD suffered and died, but not that the Godhead suffered and died.

Illustrated from S. Proclus.

This is well illustrated by the following beautiful passage from a homily of S. Proclus: "He came to save, but it was needful that He should also suffer. How was it possible that either should take place? Mere Man could not save; pure GOD could not suffer. What then? Himself being GOD IMMANUEL, became Man; and What He was saved, What He became suffered. . . . He both wore the crown of thorns, and loosed the condemnation of thorns. The same was in the Bosom of the FATHER and in the Virgin's womb. The same was in His Mother's arms and on the wings of the wind. The same was worshipped by angels and sat down with publicans. The Seraphim gazed not on Him, and Pilate questioned Him. The slave smote Him, and creation shuddered. He was nailed on the Cross, and the Throne of Glory was not vacated. He was shut up in a tomb, and He stretched out the heaven like a curtain. He was reckoned among the dead, and He despoiled hell. Here He was traduced as a deceiver, and there He was glorified as Holy. O the mystery! I see the miracles, and I proclaim the Godhead. I see the sufferings, and I deny not the Manhood. But IMMANUEL opened the gates of nature as

Man, but as GOD He brake not the seal of virginity. As He entered through the ear, so came He out of the womb. As He was conceived, so was He born. He entered impassibly, incorruptibly came He forth; according to the prophet Ezekiel, saying, 'Then He brought me back the way of the gate of the outward sanctuary which looketh towards the east; and it was shut. Then said the LORD unto me: This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the LORD, the GOD of Israel hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut' (Ezek. xliv. 1, 2)."

CHAPTER V.

THE ATONEMENT.

Introductory.

WE sometimes speak of the Incarnation and the Atonement as the two fundamental doctrines of Christianity, as indeed they are, yet logically we can scarcely divide them, since, given the existence of sin, the Atonement is but the necessary working out of the Incarnation in relation to sin.

The Atonement in its relation to the Incarnation.

Had man not fallen the Incarnation would probably have been necessary in order to take man, and in him the whole world, into GOD; but this Incarnation would have involved no suffering or pain. It would have been the glorious climax of GOD'S work of love for man. It would have been the capping-stone of the great temple of creation which was the manifestation of GOD'S love.

But man having fallen, before GOD'S loving purpose for him could be fulfilled he must be redeemed, bought back from his bondage, delivered from his sin, reunited once more to GOD, so that the Divine Life might flow again in his weakened nature.

Complexity in the idea of the Atonement

In dealing in the present chapter with that development of the Incarnation which we call the Atonement, we have first to observe the great complexity of the idea represented by this word, the many aspects in which this doctrine must be regarded in order that we

may obtain an adequate view of the work done for us by our Blessed LORD upon the Cross.

Little help from authorized definitions.

And in this we can obtain but little help from the authorized definitions of the Church, because while the dogmas of the Incarnation, the various truths which circled round the Person of CHRIST, were thoroughly discussed and accurately defined by ecumenical councils, the doctrines of our Redemption have never been submitted to such authoritative investigation.

Different schools of theology at successive periods have taken up various aspects of the Atonement, and by overstating some one point and disregarding its relation to the Christian revelation as a whole, have either unsettled men's belief in the moral attributes of GOD or weakened their realization of sin and its consequences.

Holy Scripture our chief guide.

So that if we are to grasp the Church's teaching on this mysterious subject in its integrity, we must be guided almost entirely by the statements which we find in GOD'S Holy Word.

Ideas sometimes paradoxical because fragmentary.

The ideas which go to make up this doctrine are in some cases paradoxical, because they are fragmentary. The meeting-point where they are reconciled is often beyond the range of our finite vision. But they are clearly taught in the Holy Scripture. To some who have viewed them simply in the light of natural reason they have seemed contradictory and even opposed to their moral judgment. On the other hand, before the Christian revelation was given we find human nature in its longings and beliefs bearing witness to the deeply felt need which is supplied by the Christian doctrine of Redemption through the Death of CHRIST. Outside GOD'S Church we find man everywhere expressing his need of GOD, his sense of sin, and groping after

some sacrifice by which he may expiate his sin and return to GOD.

Without, therefore, going into the controversies which gather round the Atonement, let us state the various truths which go to make up the doctrine, and briefly indicate the answers to some of the difficulties involved.

The various truths which make up the doctrine to be stated.

First, however, we must especially refer to some facts intimately connected with this doctrine: (1) the fact of sin; (2) the fact, almost as universal, of the existence of sacrifice; and (3) the fact of GOD'S attributes of Mercy and Truth, of Love and Justice.

I. Three preliminary facts must first be considered.

In investigating the fact of sin we find everywhere in human nature a twofold conception of the effect of sin on the soul; first, a sense of alienation from GOD, Who is the Source of all true life, and, flowing from this when the consequences of this separation from GOD are realized, an intense longing for a reconciliation, and yet a conviction that sinful man of himself can do nothing to accomplish this reunion with the Divine Life. Secondly, an even more deeply grounded conviction of guilt, which involves, when it is analyzed, the recognition of an external Power against Whom the sin has been committed, and also an internal feeling that we deserve punishment.

1. Twofold conception of the fact of Sin.

i A sense of alienation from GOD.

ii. A conviction of guilt.

And so this conviction of guilt leads us to say with David, "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight, that Thou mightest be justified when Thou speakest, and be clear when Thou judgest" (Ps. li. 4). The second part of this confession recognizes not merely an external Power or Person, but that this Power or Person is *just;* for the sense of guilt implies the righteousness as well as the power of Him Whom we have offended. So that

guiltiness regarded in one aspect is a sense of sin, in another it is a conviction of the wrath of GOD against sin.

[Note on the difficulty in the phrase "the wrath of GOD"].

Probably this phrase "the wrath of GOD" has led to more misunderstanding, and so has been a greater stumbling-block, than any other aspect of the doctrine of the Atonement. For from it came that horrible doctrine of Calvinism which represented GOD the FATHER as angry with His Divine SON and gloating over the sufferings by which He redeemed the world—a view so repulsive as to shock the moral sense of the Christian.

And yet the expression contains a truth of revelation —GOD'S hatred of sin (not of the sinner), and this is but a manifestation of His attribute of Justice, which demands the punishment of sin. We must bear in mind that while anger with us is very commonly a sinful passion, it is by no means necessarily so; for not only does the Bible expressly tell us to "be angry and sin not," but our moral sense witnesses to the existence of a righteous indignation against sin. It is because we are so sinful and so familiar with sin, that we feel so little indignation and anger against sin itself, but so much against those who we think have sinned against us. "Mine eyes gush out with water because men keep not Thy law" (Ps. cxix. 136), should teach us our true attitude towards sin.

Our LORD looked on the Jews in the Synagogue "with anger, being grieved at the hardness of their hearts" (S. Mark iii. 5), and yet our LORD was without sin. In our perception of GOD'S character we have to include anger; but we must remember that anger in us, even when righteous, is probably rarely free from a disturbance of the spiritual nature (due to

the weakness of our fallen state) which of course we can in no way associate with the idea of anger in GOD.

Then again, we must not confine our idea of the wrath of GOD merely to the acts by which sin is punished, or to the Day of Judgment. Rather must we see in the wrath of GOD against sin not an impulse or transient feeling, but a permanent and necessary hostility of the All-Holy One towards that which is infinitely abhorrent to the Divine Nature and absolutely opposed to His very Being. The punishment of sin is not *vindictive* but *vindicative*, being the manifestation of His righteousness or justice in the presence of moral evil.

2. The universal existence of the idea of sacrifice.

We now proceed to deal with the second universal fact, the existence everywhere of some sacrificial system. Reaching back to the gates of Paradise, extending as far as man's investigations of the religions of the world have gone, we find everywhere in some form or other the idea of sacrifice.

i. Twofold idea involved in sacrifice.

(1) Love the essential idea.

And while it has become associated with the expression of a sense of sin, the very opposite appears to have been its essential idea. For sacrifice seems at first to have been the expression of that love which sprang from man's original relation to GOD as His creature and child, the outcome of that union between GOD and man which was broken by sin. But as love existed before sin stained the human heart, so sacrifice in its essence is the effort of the human heart to express its love.

Where can we find love worthy of the name without sacrifice? That holiest love of the mother for her child,—what sacrifices it demands of thought, of sorrow, of time, of strength, of pain! The love of man and woman hallowed in Holy Matrimony begins with

sacrifice and demands sacrifices as long as it continues in this world. Under the hallowed blessing of the Church in Holy Matrimony that love begins by the one giving to the other everything,—heart, thoughts, life. So our love for GOD can be shown best and first by sacrifice. Perhaps those skins with which GOD clothed Adam and Eve as they left the Garden of Eden tell of beasts slain and offered in sacrifice as symbols of the life derived from GOD and thus in a figure given back to Him. When the shadow of sin fell upon the earth sacrifice became associated with the idea of sin and penitence. But there is no such thing as real penitence apart from love; so that even in man's sinful state sacrifice bears witness to a root of love still left in the human heart.

(2) Sin and penitence a secondary element.

ii. Twofold conception of the effects of sacrifice.

In the sin-offerings under the Mosaic Law, and indeed in the sacrificial system generally, two ideas are prominent, corresponding to the twofold conception of the effects of sin on the human soul of which we have spoken.

(1) As reconciling man with GOD.

There is the offering which simply expresses man's dependence on GOD, and recognizes that his life was derived from Him and must therefore be rendered back to Him. From this point of view the sacrifice culminated not in the slaying of the victim, but in the sprinkling of the blood, the principle of life, upon the altar in order that the lost union with GOD might be restored and life once more derived from GOD, now that it had been offered to Him. Here we have an expression of the sense of alienation from GOD caused by the fact of sin, and of the desire for reconciliation.

(2) As removing guilt and its punishment.

And in the mysterious act by which the victim became the sinner's representative, we have that side of sacrifice which corresponds to the sense of guilt in

the sinner's soul. By the Mosaic Law the offerer laid his hands upon the victim's head, putting the guilt with which he was laden upon his representative, which was then slain by the offerer himself (or as some think by the priest), the death of the victim being the confession of GOD'S justice in punishing sin.

So that the twofold conception of the sin-offering expresses a twofold sense of sin—alienation from GOD, and a sense of guilt which implies punishment. This, too, is not confined to the Mosaic Law, but may be traced almost everywhere. Before the Christian era it was seen in the human sacrifices of the Phœnicians; since then in those of the Aztecs as described by the conquerors of Mexico.

3. GOD'S Attributes of Mercy and Truth in relation to sin.

As we have found in man a twofold conception of sin and sacrifice, so we find in his notion of GOD'S relation to sin two prominent ideas, or rather a recognition of two attributes of GOD which are manifested in His dealing with sin,—the attributes of Love and Justice, or of Mercy and Truth.

i. Set forth in Holy Scripture.

And here we have one of the most striking paradoxes of the doctrine of the Atonement. On the one hand, throughout Revelation GOD is spoken of as a GOD of love and mercy; on the other hand of truth and justice. To quote but one text, in which these attributes are combined: when GOD passed before Moses He proclaimed, "The LORD, the LORD GOD, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, *forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin*, and *that will by no means clear the guilty;* visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation" (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7). We might multiply texts, but in this one

we have combined GOD'S tender mercy, GOD'S great love,—and GOD'S absolute justice, GOD'S unchangeable truth.

ii. And found outside Holy Scripture.

And if in this, as in the case of sacrifice, we look for evidence outside the Bible, we find deeply stamped upon the human heart the recognition of these two characteristics of GOD,—alas, generally not combined, as they are in Holy Scripture, but looked at apart, and therefore often distorted until they become contradictory.

iii. These two views of GOD set forth by (1) Stoics and Epicureans

(2) Pharisees and Sadducees.

(3) Calvinists and Universalists.

We see two prominent views of GOD in relation to sin sweeping down the great high-road of man's history, side by side and yet in hopeless antagonism, finding expression at one time in the rival schools of the Stoics and Epicureans, at another in the contending sects of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and to-day in the heresies of Calvinism and Universalism.

One view regards GOD as a hard, stern deity without mercy or pity or love, a God Who delights in human suffering, and exacts to the utmost the penalty of sin, a God Whom man cannot love, but can only fear.

The other view denies that there is any real existence in sin, and declares GOD to be too soft-hearted ever to punish the sinner eternally; so that no one will really perish, and sin will die out somehow when the body dies.

The Stoic stands out in hardness and severity, the Epicurean in gentleness and sensuality; the Pharisee in his bondage to rules, the Sadducee in his selfish carelessness; the Calvinist with his gloomy fatalism, the Universalist with his easy-going self-assurance; each of them having grasped one aspect of the truth and exaggerated it so as to make it contradict the other.

iv. The Cross of CHRIST the reconciliation of the paradox

Between these two modes of human thought stands the Cross of JESUS CHRIST, revealing the reconciliation of the paradox. It proclaims the revelation anticipated by the Psalmist: "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (Ps. lxxxv. 10). For through the Cross GOD reveals His intense love of the world, and His intense hatred of sin.

The Passion was a new revelation, needed to meet and reconcile these two forms of human thought which exist even now along with Revelation. The Cross shows us that GOD is a God of love and pity and mercy, and yet a God of infinite justice.

Had GOD pardoned the guilty world by the mere proclamation of His act of forgiveness, man would have lost that sense of the guilt of sin which even now sits so lightly on him. Had GOD required from man alone the penalty, man could never have paid it, and so would never have known the infinite love of GOD.

But in the fact of the Atonement GOD bears testimony to His hatred of sin, to His absolute justice, to His infinite truth, in that He punishes sin to the uttermost. And GOD reveals His marvellous love, in that He "so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten SON, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And in this, we must remember there was no division of thought or will between the FATHER and the SON. The SON hated sin as much as the FATHER did; the FATHER loved man as much as did the SON.

Thus in the Atonement the paradox of Divine Love and Justice is reconciled.

[Illustrated by the story of Zaleucus.]

One may recall here the well-known illustration from secular history, the story of Zaleucus, king of the Locri,

a sovereign famous for the severity of his justice, who, having attached the penalty of the loss of both eyes to the violation of a certain law which he had made, found that the first offender against this law was his own son. His people wondered what he would do, whether the affection of a father or the justice of a king would prevail. Zaleucus sent for the executioner, commanded his son to be brought in, and bade the executioner put out *one* of his eyes. Then descending from his throne he took his son's place, and commanded that *one* of his own eyes should be put out. Thus he reconciled the love of a father with the justice of a sovereign. His people said, "See how just he is! he exacted the penalty to the utmost! but see how loving, in that he bore such suffering for his son!" We have in this story not only the reconciliation of love and justice, but the idea of vicarious suffering, of which we must speak later on.

II. The elements of the doctrine of the Atonement.

Having investigated at some length man's conception of sin, of sacrifice, and of the relation of sin to GOD'S attributes of mercy and truth, we are now in a position to consider more in detail those elements of the Death of CHRIST which made it the "full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

1. Propitiation.

And first we must observe that it is spoken of in Holy Scripture as a *propitiation*. S. Paul, writing to the Christians at Rome, speaks of "all them that believe" "being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in CHRIST JESUS: Whom GOD hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of GOD" (Rom. iii. 22–25). And S. John says, "If any man

sin, we have an advocate with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the righteous: and He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 S. John ii. 1, 2).

i. Obedience gave the Death of CHRIST its propitiatory value.

But we may ask, What gave to the Death of CHRIST its propitiatory value? In regard to this question we must carefully distinguish between the fact of the Death of our LORD and that inner act of His Will which gave to His Death its propitiatory value. S. Bernard expresses the distinction thus: "Not His Death, but His willing acceptance of death was pleasing to GOD."

Throughout the New Testament we cannot but observe the special stress which is laid upon the perfect obedience manifested in the Life and Death of CHRIST. For instance, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, commenting on the prophecy in the fortieth Psalm, "Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin Thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said He, Lo, I come to do Thy Will, O GOD. . . . *By the which Will we are sanctified* through the offering of the Body of JESUS CHRIST once for all" (Heb. x. 8-10).

And that the perfect obedience manifested in the Passion and Death of our LORD was the element which gave to the Sacrifice its propitiatory value will be more readily appreciated, when it is remembered that the essence of man's sin was from the first disobedience, the rebellion of the human will against GOD. The obedience shown through the Life of CHRIST was on the Cross manifested in death. He "became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross" (Phil. ii. 8).

At each moment, therefore, in death as through life, His human will was exerted to keep Himself in union

with the Will of GOD. It was not a mere submission once for all, but a series of voluntary acts of resignation and obedience. Here was that spirit of sacrifice which GOD demands, and which cannot be found in any offering of sinful man.

ii. Expiation for the past another element in propitiation.

A further element of propitiation may be discerned in the Death of our LORD; for the law of righteousness, which is the justice of GOD, demands not only obedience in the present but expiation for the past. This great truth is constantly forgotten in the practical lives of Christians in the present day. The world has a saying about "turning over a new leaf," and the devil too often persuades men that this by itself is sufficient,—to turn over a new leaf, to break off from old sins and to lead a moral life. And yet this is quite useless, unless there is also the blotting out of the transgressions of the past.

The value of our LORD'S propitiatory Sacrifice, then, lay not only in its perfect obedience, the union of His human will with the Will of GOD throughout His whole life, but also in its satisfaction of GOD'S justice. This was effected through the payment of the debt incurred by sin, the propitiation of the Divine wrath by the Death on the Cross, the acknowledgment of the justice of GOD'S judgment on the sin of man.

iii. Death and victory over death essential to propitiation.

But we must add to these two considerations a third. We find both in the Old Testament anticipations and the New Testament narrative of our LORD'S work, that the Death of CHRIST—even apart from the obedience which it manifested—occupies a unique place. The frequent declaration that it was *necessary*, that "it behoved CHRIST" to die, points to something exceptional in it. And there can be no question that death was a necessary factor in the idea

of sacrifice for sin, and that the ceremonial of the slaying of the victim points to an expiatory significance in death itself.

So that while we may still recognize that it was the spirit of obedience and voluntary submission which gave atoning value to the Death of CHRIST, yet the necessity of death as the appointed consummation of His obedience must not be overlooked. "Had He not obeyed He could not have atoned; but had He not died obedience would have lacked just that element which made it an atonement for sin." There is nothing well pleasing to GOD in death alone, it is true; but there seems to be something propitiatory in death as manifesting the perfect obedience of the victim.

And then we must bear in mind that CHRIST not only died but rose again, that He overcame the great enemy of man, death, by dying; as David cut off the head of Goliath with his own sword. As S. Ambrose says, "The Wolf seized the Lamb of GOD, and found his jaw broken on the Rock of Ages." So that now the Christian can say, "O death, where is thy sting? . . . Thanks be to GOD, Which giveth us the victory through our LORD JESUS CHRIST" (1 Cor. xv. 55–57).

2. Vicarious suffering.

Another element, which has been greatly misunderstood, is the *vicarious* character of our Blessed LORD'S sufferings. Indeed it is on this that cavillers have founded their charge of injustice and immorality in the Church's teaching of the Atonement, for, they say, how can it be just that an innocent person should suffer for a guilty one? How can the justice of GOD be satisfied with such a substitution?

Without pretending to make this mystery clear, which would be impossible, we may point out three

things which may remove some of the difficulty involved in it.

i. The willingness of the Sufferer.

First, the circumstance that the Victim was a self-offered one, a willing victim, makes the greatest difference in regard to the question of injustice to the sufferer.

ii. The principle of vicarious suffering found in human experience.

Secondly, the principle of vicarious suffering is one which is to be found in life and in nature always,—the mother suffering for her child, the father paying his son's debts. And we must carefully remember that in these cases, as in the great fact which they illustrate, vicarious suffering is of no moral advantage to him for whom it is borne unless he distinctly appropriates it to himself by an act of his own. So, too, the mediation which obtains mercy for the criminal is ineffective unless it produces also a change in him. In like manner the vicarious suffering of CHRIST for our sins is of no value to us as individuals unless we appropriate the merits of His Passion by using the means of grace which flow from it.

iii. The representative character of the Victim.

Thirdly, we must bear in mind that the substitution implied something more than a mere artificial relation between the Victim and him for whom He suffered. Our LORD JESUS CHRIST was our Representative from the fact that He had taken human nature into Himself. And this human nature was so real and so perfect that He was involved, so to speak, in all the consequences of the sin which is so tremendous a factor in human life,—even to the enduring of the very sufferings and death which in us are the penal results and final outcome of sin, but which in Him were the instruments of His free self-sacrifice. He is our Representative thus perfectly because He is both man and more than man, and can therefore perform for us what we could not and cannot perform for ourselves.

Here is the true vicariousness of the Atonement, which consisted not in the mere substitution of His punishment for ours, but in His offering the Sacrifice which man had neither the purity nor the power to offer. The Sacrifice of the Cross was of *infinite* value because it was offered by GOD to GOD. And it was a representative Sacrifice, for, unique though it was, it consisted in no unheard-of experience, no merely symbolical ceremony, but just those universal incidents of suffering which (though CHRIST must have felt them with a bitterness unknown to us,) are intensely human, —poverty, misunderstanding, failure, treachery, rejection, bodily anguish, spiritual desolation, death. "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." "The chastisement of our peace was upon Him," and therefore "with His stripes we are healed."

3. Reconciliation of GOD and man.

Another element of the Sacrifice is its power to restore the broken union between GOD and man, both by reconciling us to GOD and by reconciling GOD to us; the first by delivering us from the sin which separated us absolutely from GOD; the second by conveying to us the Divine gift of life, which had been forfeited by sin. "By the Sacrifice of His own Body," as S. Athanasius says, "He both *put an end to the law* which was against us, and gave us *a fresh beginning of life*, in that He bestowed on us the hope of resurrection."

i. By deliverance from sin.

ii. By the gift of Divine life.

iii. By the imparted Righteousness of CHRIST.

By the imparted righteousness of CHRIST through the Sacraments and the appropriation of these through the co-operation of the human will, man is enabled as it were to weave into his very character the righteousness of CHRIST, and so to obtain "the wedding-garment required of GOD in Holy Scripture,"— "holiness without which no man shall see the LORD"

(Heb. xii. 14). This *imparted* righteousness must be carefully distinguished from the Lutheran doctrine of *imputed* righteousness, a legal fiction which represents GOD as covering human nature, defiled by all its sins, with the garment of CHRIST'S righteousness,—in which case the righteousness becomes no more a part of the nature of man than is the coat which he wears. By the imparting of CHRIST'S righteousness man is *made* holy; by the imputation of it he is by an unworthy fiction only *accounted* as holy, while his sinfulness still remains.

III. Concluding remarks.

Three stages in the work of Redemption.

1. Deliverance from sin.

2. The gift of life.

So there seem to be three steps or stages in the work of redemption as taught in the New Testament: first, it was to free us from sin, for our LORD was "the Lamb of GOD, Which taketh away the sin of the world" (S. John i. 29). In the next stage this deliverance from sin is identified with the gift of life: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (S. John x. 10); "My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (S. John vi. 51); "He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him Which died for them, and rose again" (2 Cor. v. 15); "Who His own Self bare our sins in His own Body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness" (1 S. Peter ii. 24). And in the last place, this gift of life is to issue in union with the life of GOD in CHRIST: "CHRIST . . . suffered for our sins, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to GOD" (1 S. Peter iii. 18); "In CHRIST JESUS ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the Blood of CHRIST" (Eph. ii. 13).

3. The gift of union with GOD.

And yet we must remember, in treating of the Atone-

ment, that our Lord's Death is continually spoken of in the New Testament in close connection with the Resurrection and the Ascension. For, as was foreshadowed by the ceremonies of the law, the Sacrifice of CHRIST culminated in the presentation before the altar of GOD'S Presence of the life which had passed through death.

The Atonement includes the Resurrection and Ascension of CHRIST.

Thus, our Lord Himself declares that He died in order to rise again : "I lay down My life that I might take it again" (S. John x. 17). So, to S. Paul, the Resurrection is the necessary completion of the process which was begun by death : "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" (Rom. iv. 25); "We are buried with Him by Baptism into death : that like as CHRIST was raised up from the dead by the glory of the FATHER, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4); "It is CHRIST that died, yea rather, that is risen again, Who is even at the right hand of GOD, Who also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. viii. 34).

Hence another element in the Atonement is that perpetual intercession of our Blessed Lord at the right hand of the FATHER in Heaven which constitutes Him our Mediator, our Great High Priest,—(1) our Mediator in His twofold Nature, for if He were not GOD His mediation could not have the infinite efficacy which is needed, and if He were not Man it would not be true mediation, for He would have nothing in common with the nature to be reconciled; and (2) our Great High Priest, for the eternity of His Priesthood is seen in this, that in Heaven He is ever representing to His FATHER the satisfaction which He has made, and distributing to men the supernatural grace that He has merited for them.

By which He becomes our Mediator and Great High Priest.

Importance of grasping all the elements which make up this doctrine.

It is of deep importance that we should avoid the error into which so many have fallen, of considering that our deliverance from sin by the Death of CHRIST is all that we have to think of. To men individually the Atonement is of little value unless it leads to the life of union with CHRIST by means of the grace which flows from the mediation of the risen and ascended Saviour. We must ever bear in mind, as has already been said, that the merits of the Atonement are of no avail unless appropriated by the individual through faith. And by "faith" is meant not only that objective belief in the fact of the Atonement, but that subjective trust in the merits and Person of CHRIST which leads to *obedience* shown in using the means of grace instituted by CHRIST and in keeping the commandments of CHRIST and His Church.

The merits of the Atonement of no avail unless appropriated by the individual through faith.

This faith not only objective but subjective.

By His Life and Death CHRIST made satisfaction for the sins of all men, that is, sufficient for all mankind, for through the Atonement sufficient grace is given to every soul for its salvation; but grace, though sufficient, if neglected, becomes of no avail.

The Sacrifice of CHRIST offered to the Holy Trinity, but especially to GOD the FATHER.

The Sacrifice which our Lord offered on Calvary was a propitiation for the sins of all those who had passed to their last account *before* His Advent, being retroactive in its effect, as well as for the sins of all who should come after. And it was offered to the Holy Trinity, but especially to GOD the FATHER.

It includes all good works wrought in CHRIST.

The offering on Calvary includes all good works wrought in CHRIST, so that our Lord offered upon the Cross not only His own sufferings and merits but those of His Church, both of the Old and New Covenant; for all those deeds which are wrought through faith in Him have their value only from His precious Death and Sacrifice. Thus it is that what we suffer now

enables us to "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of CHRIST" (Col. i. 24).

Among the many other benefits of His Passion the chief are the Sacraments, which contain and convey the grace they symbolize; and His superabundant merits, which are laid up as a rich treasure for His Church.

Among its benefits are 1. The Sacraments 2. And His merits, the treasure of the Church.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH.

Introductory.

THE Incarnation and the Atonement affected humanity as a race only. Some means, therefore, was needed to transmit the priceless gifts which flowed from them to the individuals of which the race was composed, not only at the time when our Lord was on earth, but to the end of the world. It was necessary that the Divine Presence of our Blessed Redeemer should be more than transient if it was to effect its purpose in the permanent restoration of our fallen nature.

The formation of the Church.

For this end, therefore, our Lord founded His Church. As GOD had first formed man's body of the dust and then breathed into it the breath of life, so our Lord by His Ministry on earth took out of mankind certain individuals whom He trained and moulded to be as it were the body of His Church, and then on the day of Pentecost the HOLY GHOST descended upon this body and breathed into it the breath of Divine life. Thus the Church became the living agent by which the graces and blessings which flowed from CHRIST were dispensed to each individual soul that would appropriate them. Then was fulfilled the prophecy of the Psalmist, "He sendeth out His Word, and melteth them: He bloweth with His Wind, and the waters flow" (Ps. cxlvii. 18). As GOD had caused a deep

sleep to fall upon Adam, and while he slept took from his side that from which Eve was formed, so when our Lord, the Second Adam, rested upon the Cross in the deep sleep of death, from His opened side was taken that which typified His Bride, the Church.

1. Definition of Church.

The Saxon word "Church" is a translation of the Greek ἐκκλησία (from ἔκκλητος, meaning "called out"), which signifies that collection of individuals who have been called out of the world into the Body of CHRIST. The Church consists of all who have been admitted into the Body of CHRIST by Baptism, so long as they preserve their living union with Him.

1. Three divisions of the Church.

It exists now in three great divisions: the Church Triumphant in Heaven, composed of the Saints who enjoy the Beatific Vision; the Church Expectant in Purgatory, which is being purified and prepared for that Vision; and the Church Militant on earth, which consists of all the baptized who are still in the body. In using the term "Church" hereafter in this chapter we may, however, generally be understood as referring to the Church Militant only.

i. Triumphant.
ii. Expectant.
iii. Militant.

2. Three titles of the Church.

The Church is spoken of in the Holy Scriptures under three special titles: as the "Bride" of CHRIST (Rev. xxi. 2, 9; xxii. 17); as the "Body of CHRIST" (1 Cor. xii. 27; Eph. iii. 6; iv. 12; Col. i. 18); and as the "Kingdom of Heaven" (S. Matt. xiii. 24; xvi. 19; etc.).

i. The Bride of CHRIST.

As the Bride of CHRIST, the Church is our Mother. We therefore owe her our love and obedience, and it is her duty to train us as GOD'S children, looking to that day when she may present us to her Bridegroom, saying, "Behold I and the children which GOD hath given me" (Heb. ii. 13).

ii. The Body of CHRIST.

The Church is the Body of CHRIST. This tells us of the closeness of our union with CHRIST, of the oneness of our life with

Him. As members of that one Body we share its blessings and bear together its sorrows; and as when one member suffers all the members suffer with it (1 Cor. xii. 26), so we are responsible by our sanctity or by our sin for helping or hindering the Body of CHRIST. As the Kingdom of Heaven, the Church has her own laws, officers, privileges and obligations; as the Kingdom of Heaven, too, she is opposed to the kingdom of this world, which surrounds her.

iii. The Kingdom of Heaven.

A living body must have the means of growth and of self-propagation, and of supplying the waste of its tissues, all which are effected in CHRIST'S Body the Church by the Sacraments. A kingdom must have in it some principle of continuity by which its governors and administrative officers may be perpetuated. This principle of continuity in the Kingdom of Heaven is found in the law of apostolical succession. The threefold Ministry of the Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons constitute the ordinary officers of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Bishops succeeding one another in an unbroken chain from CHRIST Himself, through His Apostles and their successors the Bishops of the Church, and reaching down to the Episcopate of the present day.

Apostolic succession.

A man can only convey to another the powers that he himself possesses. A congregation is but an aggregate of laymen, and possesses no spiritual powers which are not possessed by the individuals of which it is composed, so that those ministries which are derived from the congregation can have no spiritual gifts other than those which belong to the laity. Such is the case in all the sects, since they have not the apostolical succession. The Church's Ministry, however, receives its gifts not from the congregation but from the Head of the Body, CHRIST, through the channel of apostolical succession, and these gifts are altogether different from

The sectarian ministry.

those possessed by the lay members of CHRIST'S Church. So that the Priest of the Church is the Minister of CHRIST, Whose gifts he ministers; while sectarians are but the ministers of the people, whose charities they dispense.

The Ministry of the Church.

While the Anglican Church speaks of the threefold Ministry as comprising Bishops, Priests and Deacons, many writers of the Roman Church make a different division of the same Orders—Priests, Deacons and Sub-Deacons, placing the Bishops in the same class as the Priests, and enumerating in all seven orders of the Ministry, four of which are called Minor Orders, namely, Acolytes, Exorcists, Readers and Porters. But all agree that the most important Ministry is that of the Priesthood, since the chief purpose of the Ministry is to offer to GOD the most holy Sacrifice of the Altar, the continual Memorial of the Death of CHRIST, whereby GOD is most glorified and man most blessed; and that the "character" conveyed by Holy Orders is the character of a Priest.

The powers of the Priesthood are three: (1) to celebrate the Holy Eucharist; (2) to absolve from sin; and (3) to give GOD'S benediction. The special powers of the Episcopate are to confer Holy Orders and to confirm. The Diaconate is but the preparation for the Priesthood, and possesses no special spiritual power.

We must try clearly to grasp the importance of this doctrine of an apostolical Ministry, for without it the Church would be deprived of all Sacraments except Baptism and Holy Matrimony.

The Church, which is CHRIST'S Body, claims not only to perpetuate His Presence in the world, but to speak with His authority and to minister to all man's needs.

Among her other powers the Church claims to speak

II. The four principal functions of the Church.

with unerring certainty on all the necessary questions of the human soul. That is to say, the Church is (1) the Guardian and Teacher of Truth; (2) the unerring Guide in Morals; (3) the Dispenser of Grace; and (4) the Director of Worship.

1. The Church as the teacher of absolute truth.

S. Paul calls the Church "the Church of the Living GOD, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 S. Tim. iii. 15). But what is truth? Minds differ, philosophers disagree. Is it possible to find an adequate answer to this question of all questions, "What is truth?" Yes, it is possible for Christians; for if there be one thing which the Gospel of CHRIST claims to do, it is to answer this question. Our Lord JESUS CHRIST Himself says, "I am the Truth" (S. John xiv. 6); and on the solemn occasion when His work on earth was done—except the one last act of love and sacrifice, death itself—JESUS said to Pilate, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My Voice" (S. John xviii. 37). And on another occasion in speaking of His Church He said, "He that heareth you heareth Me" (S. Luke x. 16); and to the Apostolic College the promise was left, "When He, the SPIRIT of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth" (S. John xvi. 13); and to S. Peter He promised, "Upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (S. Matt. xvi. 18); and yet once more, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (S. John viii. 32). So that if we call ourselves Christians we cannot doubt that there is an answer to the question, "What is truth?" and that the answer is to be found in the Church which our Lord built on the rock of His Divinity.

Scriptural authority.

Man's thirst for truth and freedom.

One of the most deeply-seated cravings of human nature is the desire to know truth. We could hardly conceive of any man as a good man if he were not a seeker after truth. And next to the thirst of the human intellect to know truth is the passion of the human heart for liberty. Our Lord links these two passions together when He says, "Ye shall know *the truth*, and the truth shall make you *free*." There is but one man in this world who is truly wise and truly free, and that is the member of the Catholic Church, the Christian. There are those who dream of freedom and who exchange, perhaps, the fetters of government for the bondage of lust—the slavery of their own uncontrolled passions; but there is no man, it matters not under what government he lives, who is truly free unless he knows the truth as CHRIST has revealed it, unless he "stands fast in the liberty wherewith CHRIST hath made us free."

Spheres of truth.

Truth has its divisions, its separate spheres. There are the truths of the physical world, the "laws of nature," as we call them. This is scientific truth, and science strictly has nothing to do with anything beyond this world. With scientific truth the Church of CHRIST has properly very little in common. The Church need not fear scientific truth, ought not to teach scientific truth, is not hostile to scientific truth; it is simply not the sphere of truth which was committed to her by her Lord. Scientific truth, while it interests the busy brain and assists us in the pursuit of wealth, while it fascinates us with its wonderful discoveries and still more wonderful promises, yet finds no echo in the soul. The magnificent inductions of science, the laborious toil of many minds and many years, the marvellous secrets which science has wrested from nature, may

i. Scientific truth.

inspire our intellects with admiration, but they answer no questions of the soul, they stir no love in the heart, they cause no change in the life.

ii. Metaphysical truth.

But when we leave physical science and enter the realms of pure thought, of metaphysics, the questions which arise thrill the soul, kindle the heart, and clamor at the gates of the intellect for an answer. And many of these questions of the soul it is the province and the privilege of the Church to answer. Dr. Martineau, in his "Study of Religion," quotes the remark of an eminent positivist and unbeliever: "You cannot make the slightest concession to metaphysics without ending in a theology." You cannot make, says this scientific man, the slightest concession to metaphysics, to pure thought, without its leading you inexorably into a theology. This simply amounts to the confession from an enemy that you cannot allow yourself to think of the origin or the end of things without being led by the inexorable logic of thought to believe in the existence of GOD. Or, to put it more briefly, this unbeliever says in effect, "You must not think; for if you think, you must believe in GOD."

Leads to theology.

Belief in GOD'S existence leads to belief in revelation.

But you cannot stop here, with a mere belief in GOD; for if you believe in Him it is difficult to escape the conviction that He has revealed Himself to you. And when you want to know more of Him and His revelation, you are confronted with the Church claiming His authority to teach you. If, however, any one should oppose to the authority of the Church as a teacher the rival claims of philosophy, it is a very simple thing to point out the difference. In philosophy we find a very Babel of teachers, contradicting one another at almost every point, the best of them agreeing only in this one thing, that there can be no certainty of truth unless it be

The rival claims of philosophy as a teacher.

revealed by a god. For the greatest thinkers of Rome and Greece—Plato and Cicero, Democritus and Anaxagoras and Empedocles—all agree in this, that the human mind is prone to error, and that it is impossible to reach absolute truth unless a god come down from Heaven to reveal it. Thus we read in the Platonic dialogue, *Alcibiades*, "We will wait for one, be he a god or inspired man, to instruct us . . . and . . . to take away the darkness from our eyes." Or, as Cicero says, after citing a long series of philosophical opinions, "Which of these opinions is true, a god may know; but which is even probable is a great question."

The confession of philosophers.

More than two thousand years have passed since these men lived, and the keenest minds of the world have turned all their powers upon the problem of human life, of truth and error, of good and evil; and while they have made some advance in proving many things false which were believed to be true, they are no nearer certainty regarding what is *the truth*, than men were in the days of Plato. We as Christians believe that God did come down from Heaven to reveal to us truth; that He founded His Church for that purpose; and in striking contrast to philosophy we find that the Church has spoken with no faltering voice on all the great questions of the human soul, and has never had occasion to retract any of her utterances; that is to say, there is no truth on which the Church has spoken dogmatically which has ever been disproved. The history of philosophy is a history of varying opinions, each school disproving the conclusions of its predecessors. The history of the Church is the history of an authority which has never varied and which has never been proved untrue.

The Church's sphere of truth.

Truth has its various spheres, and the sphere in which the Church of CHRIST is sovereign deals with two subjects: GOD and the soul. There is no question of grave importance about GOD or the soul which the Church is not prepared definitely to answer. Truth which concerns GOD and the soul may be subdivided into two classes: (1) necessary truth, and (2) speculative truth.

i. Necessary truth.

Necessary truth is that truth which the soul needs in order to allay its fears, to clear away its doubts, and to furnish a basis for human action; and

ii. Speculative truth.

Speculative truth deals with matters which while they may be intensely interesting have no real importance as factors in human life. For instance, speculative truth may lead us to inquire into the state of the faithful departed, or the condition of the glorified Saints in Heaven. All that is necessary truth on *these* points is that there is an intermediate state where souls are purified; but *how* they are purified is simply speculative. That the Saints do see GOD in Heaven the Bible tells us, and therefore it is necessary truth; but *how* they see Him is pure speculation allowed within certain limits by the Church to her theologians.

The Method of the Church's teaching.

How does the Church teach authoritatively in regard to truth? In three ways: (1) by her Creeds; (2) by the dogmatic decrees of the undisputed General or Œcumenical Councils; and (3) through the *consensus* of her theologians and faithful children.

i. Creeds.

In her Creeds we have but a short summary of the principal doctrines of the Christian religion. Short as they are, they prevent in those who believe them the numerous perplexities caused by the wild speculation of the present day.

ii. General Councils.

A General Council needs two things to make it binding on us, to make it really œcumenical: first, that all

the Bishops of the Church should have been invited to it, or rather that none should have been intentionally excluded from it, so that it should represent the whole Church; secondly, that after the Council is ended, and its decrees have been promulgated, the whole Church should accept them. Apart from these conditions—and the more important of them is the second—it would not be a General Council. The General Councils have decided once and for all nearly every question connected with the Nature and Person of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST, and implicitly the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

iii. Consensus of theologians and of the faithful.

S. Vincent of Lerins, who lived in the fifth century, about three years after the Council of Ephesus, wrote a work which he called the "Commonitorium," or Remembrancer, and in the third chapter he lays down the principle on which he is about to proceed to investigate what is the Catholic Faith. The principle is expressed in one short phrase: "*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*,"—that which has been held everywhere, always, and by the consent of all. Or we may express it more tersely in three words: Universality, Antiquity and Consent. If you take any doctrine and can find on examination that it has been held in every part of the Church, throughout her history, and with the consent of her theologians you can say, "This is truth, absolute truth."

Rule of S. Vincent of Lerins.

Here we see how greatly the sects fail as teachers. For on examination we find that their distinctive doctrines (that is, those points on which they have separated from the Church) do not fulfil any of these conditions. This will be illustrated in the next chapter where certain fundamental verities of the Faith will be examined historically. Here, however, it may be

Sectarian teaching tested by it.

remarked in passing, that the doctrines of the sects are only like the sects themselves. For if we consider their origin—where is their Antiquity? Like mushrooms they have sprung up within the last three hundred years. Where is their Universality? They are like some pool left in the sand by the receding waves of the ocean, about as large in proportion to the Church, and about as important,—a pool which remains there for a little while, but is sucked up in the sand and disappears. Where is their Consent? The East will have nothing to do with them, nor the West. They do not fulfil any of the necessary conditions.

2. The Church as the guide in morals.

Here we turn from dogma to morals, from the truth in which we must believe to the truth by which we must live,—from the truth which enlightens our intellect to the truth which guides our will. In morals the Church claims to give the laws and principles of human conduct, and this claim is closely allied to her claim to be the teacher of truth; for we must first believe rightly or we cannot *act* rightly. It is a true saying: if you corrupt a man's theology, you corrupt his morals.

History of ethics.

In examining the history of philosophy we find a Babel of contradictory opinions. In the history of ethics we find almost greater discord. The various schools of ethics cannot even agree on any one basis of morals, or that in fact morals have any basis. Leslie Stephen confesses in the introduction to his "Science of Ethics": "In one sense moralists are almost unanimous; in another they are hopelessly discordant. They are unanimous in pronouncing certain classes of conduct to be right and the opposite wrong. No moralist denies that cruelty, falsehood and intemperance are vicious, or that mercy, truth and temper-

Confession of moralists.

ance are virtuous. . . . But if we turn from the matter to the form of morality; if, instead of asking what actions are right or wrong, we ask, what is the essence of right and wrong? how do we know right from wrong? why should we seek the right and eschew the wrong?—we are presented with the most contradictory answers; we find ourselves at once in that region of perpetual antinomies, where controversy is everlasting, and opposite theories seem to be equally self-evident to different minds."

Here a scientific writer, quite unbiassed on the side of the Church or of religion, confesses at the outset of his treatise on morals, that while there may be some consent regarding what is right and what is wrong, there is absolutely no agreement concerning the *basis* of morality, and why things are right or why they are wrong. And when he flatters himself that there is some unanimity in the *matter* of morals, is he not too hopeful? For while those particular things which he mentions—cruelty, falsehood, intemperance on the one hand, mercy, truth, temperance on the other, may be universally accepted in the abstract, there is no agreement whatever in their application to concrete cases—no agreement whatever apart from the law of human conduct which the Church lays down.

The Church's code of morals.

Amid all this discord the Church of the Living GOD speaks in calm and certain tones and says to the Christian, "Keep my laws, and your life will be a happy one."

i. Matter.

Regarding the *matter* of morals,—what things are right or wrong,—the Church takes the life and teachings of JESUS CHRIST, and from them frames a system of morals to which she demands absolute obedience.

ii. Form.

In regard to the *form* of morals,—why things are

right or wrong,—she bases her teaching on man's eternal relation to GOD as his Creator and his End.

Scientific moralists differ concerning: i. The basis of morals. ii. The standard of morals. iii. The necessity of morals.

Stephen, in his "Science of Ethics," admits that all systems of morals are in hopeless contradiction on three points: first, What is the essence of right and wrong? secondly, How do we know right from wrong? thirdly, Why should we seek the right and eschew the wrong? On these three points he admits that scientific moralists can never agree,—that there is no answer.

i. The Church's basis.

The Church without difficulty, without evasion, without hesitation, answers (1) in regard to the essence of right and wrong, "GOD'S will, especially revealed to man, is the basis of all morality. Things are right because GOD has revealed that they are His will; and wrong because He has forbidden them." (2) In reply to the question, How do we know right from wrong? she says, "Through the moral teachings of the Church. There is no subject of any consequence affecting man's conduct on which the Church has not ruled over and over again. You can know by finding out what the Church teaches." (3) To the third question, Why should we seek the right and eschew the wrong? the Church replies, "Man's essential relation to GOD as his Creator obliges him to strive to attain his highest good, which is at once his beatitude and his perfection; since this is the purpose for which GOD made him, and there is a day of Judgment, when every soul of man must stand before the judgment seat of GOD and render an account of the stewardship committed to him, and receive the eternal result of his life and acts in eternal happiness or eternal misery." At least the Church is consistent; at least the Church is clear; if there is a GOD and an eternity, certainly the Church is right.

ii. The Church's standard.

iii. The Church's theory of necessity.

Another point on which moralists are hopelessly in contradiction with one another is the "summum bonum"—to use an ethical term—the question, What is the chief good of man? in what does man's ultimate happiness consist? The Church of GOD with the calmness of certainty replies, "Man's ultimate happiness consists objectively in GOD, subjectively in the happiness which will come to him at the last in the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision of GOD Himself."

The basis of the Church's code.

The revelation on which the Church's code of morals is founded consists of the Law of the Old Covenant and the Law of the Gospel, the latter taking up into itself, modifying and interpreting the former; so that the Ten Commandments of the Old Law are enshrined in the Sermon on the Mount, modified and explained and confirmed through the Law of the Gospel. The Gospel is productive as well as imperative, since it carries with it the Divine grace which makes its fulfilment possible; for it not only commands but gives the strength by which we can obey the command.

Sphere of morals. i. Precepts. ii. Counsels.

In morals we have to distinguish in the revelation of the Gospel between commands and counsels, just as in absolute truth we had to distinguish between necessary and speculative truth, between what was *de fide* and what was a matter of theological opinion. So the Gospel has certain commands which every one must obey, and certain counsels which those must obey who feel themselves led by the Holy Ghost to seek the highest life; that is, every one must walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called (Eph. iv. 1).

The Church's code tested by the rule of S. Vincent.

The Church's moral theology may be tested, like her dogmatic theology, by reference to the three principles, Antiquity, Universality and Consent. If you ask a question in morals—"Is this right or wrong?"

—the Church's answer is not only in accordance with her teaching to-day but with her teaching in all time on all questions of morals. You can point to the early Christians, to the Middle Ages, and show consent, universality and antiquity. The Church's moral teaching, again, like her dogmatic teaching, never changes. What is right to-day was right a thousand years ago; what was wrong a thousand years ago can never be right to-day. The Church speaks with no faltering lips, the Church of the Living God is as fearless as her King was, and whatever may be the consequences in persecution to herself, she never wavers in regard to what is right and what is wrong.

Two objections. i. Conscience as the only guide.

Two questions may arise in the minds of some, "Is not conscience a sufficient guide in morals? If a man honestly thinks a thing is right, is not that sufficient?" Not if you are a Christian. Not if you are a person of even moderate intellectual attainments, because you must know that conscience uneducated is a most uncertain guide; conscience unenlightened by the Holy Ghost often guides wrongly. The red Indian thinks it is right to torture and scalp and burn his foes, but the fact that he thinks it is right does not make it right. Conscience untrained, unguided, unenlightened, is no more help in morals than reason without revelation is in the domain of truth.

ii. Civil law as the sufficient guide.

Again, some may say, "Is not the law of the land in which I live a sufficient guide in morals?" Certainly not, because the law of the land is only intended to protect society. No government constructed on modern principles claims to regulate individual conduct. The law of the land is a necessary protection for society; it has nothing whatever to do with individual life or conduct. The law of the land in civilized countries is

generally not contrary to the law of the Church in its *positive* commands. The law of the land in this country does not command us to do anything which is contrary to the teaching of the Church; but unfortunately the law itself permits, or does not punish us for doing, what the Church absolutely forbids. Take the commonest and worst example—adultery and incest. The law of the land, except in South Carolina, permits adultery, that is, permits a divorced person to marry again and commit adultery, provided certain legal forms have been complied with in some State or other. The law of the land in many States permits incest, that is to say, marriage within the prohibited degrees, forbidding it only in the first and second degrees,—forbidding parents and children and brother and sister—but permitting any one else to marry, even uncle and niece. The law of the land permits it but does not command it. The law of the Church says those who do it are adulterers and adulteresses or living in incest.

3. The Church as the dispenser of grace.

The Church claims to give to the restless mind of man an absolute standard by which he may measure all necessary truth, and a guide in morals by which he must rule his life if he is to claim his portion in the Kingdom of Heaven; that is, she teaches him to think rightly and to act rightly. But if this were all, man's need would be but poorly supplied, for the Old Covenant of Judaism did this. The dogmas of Moses were fewer than those of the Christian Church, but they were not less clear; the code of morals given by Moses was less perfect, but it was not less definite; and the Jews after twelve hundred years of experience learned by failure again and again that an absolute standard of truth, an unerring code of morals, was insufficient, through the inherent weakness of poor human nature. What more, then,

does the Church claim to do? She claims to give also grace, that special gift of GOD which enables man to keep GOD's law. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by JESUS CHRIST" (S. John i. 17). So that the Church claims not only to be the teacher of truth and the guide in morals, but—loving Mother of us all!—to be the dispenser of that grace which enables us to fulfil her laws.

We have already stated that all grace flows from the Incarnation, and chiefly through the Sacraments, and as we shall treat of each of them in turn it is unnecessary to say more under this head than that the Church, as the dispenser of grace through her Sacramental system, enables man to fulfil the law of GOD.

4. The Church as the director of worship.

Our Blessed Lord founded His Church not only to teach man truth, and to guide man in morals, and to dispense to man grace, but also to enable man to worship GOD acceptably. Indeed, from one point of view, it would be true to say that this was the first purpose of CHRIST'S Church, to teach men how to worship GOD rightly and so to prepare them for that life in Heaven which will be one long, unbroken act of worship.

Importance of a law of worship.

A fallacious theory refuted positively.

There is a theory very prevalent in our day that it does not matter how a man worships GOD so long as he is sincere in his worship. This theory finds no support whatever in the Bible or in the history of the Church. For in the Bible we find GOD giving to Moses not only a law of morals and a revelation of truth but a law of worship, remarkable for its minuteness of detail; a law of ritual which descends to the smallest detail of the priest's vestments, and even to the ingredients of which the incense is to be made,—nothing being left to individual choice.

We find in the Old Testament, at least on two occasions, that law of worship violated by those who thought that it did not matter how man worshipped God. The first is the case of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, who asserted, as sectarians do now, that worship need not be offered by a priest, but could be offered by a layman. But God intervened; and the earth opened and swallowed up Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Num. xvi.). Again, when the Ark was being moved to Jerusalem after its long sojourn at Kirjath-Jearim, David and Uzzah, certainly not in any spirit of wilfulness, but in ignorance of the ritual law which God had appointed, considered that the proper way to remove the Ark was in an ox-cart. But God, in the books of Exodus and Numbers, had most carefully directed that it was to be moved in a very different way,—that staves were to be put through the rings at the four corners of the Ark by which it might be carried, and that it was to be carried by one particular tribe of Levites, the Kohathites. The ox-cart shook, Uzzah put out his hand, in all good faith, to save the Ark from falling, and was struck dead (2 Sam. vi.). These two instances which tell of the neglect of the law of worship given by God certainly do not afford any countenance to the theory that it does not matter in what way a man worships God.

i. By the example of Korah.

ii. Of Uzzah.

But to pass from the Old Testament to the New, when our Lord was on earth the Temple of Herod far surpassed in magnificence anything that had been in the time of Solomon, and the services and ritual (though the life was wanting) were more beautiful, more carefully rendered, perhaps, than at any previous time. Our Lord was a constant worshipper in the Temple, and yet He never gave any sign of disapproval of that worship. He abrogated the slavish observance

The theory refuted negatively by our Lord.

of the Sabbath, the washing of cups and platters, the tithing of anise and cummin, but there is nothing which shows that He discountenanced the worship which had been enjoined by GOD Himself. But this is not all; for in the Revelation S. John tells us of the vision of Heaven and of the ritual and worship which he saw there, and from that description the Church has framed much of her law of worship.

The Church's ritual symbolical.

Everything in the Church's ritual is symbolical, so that the eye as well as the ear may be taught by the worship of the Church. The Church claims to regulate and direct every detail of her services, in order that man may learn to worship GOD acceptably here, and so prepare himself for the worship of Heaven in eternity.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH'S DOCTRINE.

Introductory.

WE have claimed for the Church that she is the only Teacher of absolute Truth, the unerring Guide in Morals, the Dispenser of Grace and the Director of Worship. We must now speak of the source from which she derives her doctrine and the streams through which it flows.

Three witnesses to the Church's doctrine.

There is but one *Source* from which the Church derives her doctrines, the revelation of Almighty GOD, the *ultimate* ground of divine faith and therefore of doctrine. But there are two fountains or streams from which this revelation is drawn, Holy Scripture and Tradition. And to these we must add Human Reason as the *ordinary* instrument by which this revelation is devoutly studied, appropriated and applied.

I. Tradition.

Tradition is a term which to many suggests uncertain history, or perhaps untrustworthy legends; yet it is the most certain source of truth, for it is the living Voice of the Church, that is, the utterance of the HOLY GHOST. But first, let us define Tradition, at least the Tradition of the Church. Tradition is not merely the handing on of things which are no more; it is really the continuity of the past in the future. Without Tradition the Church's life would be a succession of moments without connection, like one drop of water fall-

Definition.

ing after another drop of water. It would be without unity. While personality is that on which human nature is organized in each individual, yet memory is the power that to the individual makes the old man and the child one; in the Church it is Tradition that makes the Church of to-day *identical in her teaching* with that of the Apostles. Memory may fail, but Tradition, being the Voice of the HOLY GHOST, cannot.

Illustration of Tradition from man's physical nature.

The Church is the Mystical Body of CHRIST; and, to use an illustration which we have in part employed before, as GOD first made the body of Adam and then breathed into it the breath of life, so CHRIST collected the materials of His Mystical Body on earth, during His ministry, and at Pentecost sent the HOLY GHOST, breathed into that Body the Breath of Life, and the Church became a living organism.

To continue this analogy a step further, we may observe that as our bodies are daily wasting away and being renewed, so that after a lapse of years we are materially different and yet essentially the same, so is it with the Body of CHRIST'S Church *on earth*. The individual members of which it is composed to-day are not the same as formed the visible Church a hundred years ago or in Apostolic times, and yet the waste, so to speak, which has been caused by death has been made up by the additions through Baptism, and the Church Militant at any period is therefore identical with the Church at any other period. And the link which constitutes this identity as regards her *teaching* is Tradition, just as memory is the link which connects the grown man with the child. But the difference between Tradition and memory is the difference between certainty and uncertainty, for one is the organ of the HOLY GHOST, the other only a human instrument.

Tradition and the unction of the HOLY GHOST.

That this is the teaching not of the Church alone but of the Bible we shall see if we read carefully the second chapter of the first Epistle of S. John, verses 20, 21 and 27 : " But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth. . . . But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you : but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him."

In these words S. John, writing to the Church at the end of the first century, affirms (1) that it had already received the unction of the SPIRIT of Truth, and that therefore its members had no need to seek for knowledge elsewhere, because this unction enabled them to know all things, for it was the unction of the HOLY SPIRIT; (2) that they had no need of human teachers (" ye need not that any man teach you "); (3) that this unction is absolute truth, that it is no lie, that is, it is not mixed with any falsehood, error or doubt. This unction rested first on our Great High Priest, JESUS CHRIST, the Head of the Church, and from Him descends upon His Body, which is the Church, and goes " down to the skirts of His clothing," that is to the members who abide in the Church.

Two results of this : i. The Church's doctrines are infallible,

From this we may draw the following necessary conclusions: that all the doctrines of the Church which are *de fide* are incorrupt and incorruptible. Individuals may err. The Church is not an individual, but the Body of CHRIST, in which dwells the HOLY SPIRIT, and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. Again, that what is incorruptible is unchangeable, so

ii. and unchangeable.

that the doctrines of the Church are the same to-day as at the beginning. All corruption is change, but all change is not corruption.

Analogy of a tree.

There is a change which destroys, and a change which perfects the identity of things. For instance, all growth is change, yet the oak of the forest has perfect identity with the acorn from which it sprang; and the change of ages which has passed upon it perfects its identity by unfolding its stateliness and beauty and strength. On the other hand, all decay is change. When the branches of that oak droop, when the tree dies and falls into the dust, this stage is corruption.

The Church's doctrines tested.

By this rule we may test the doctrines of the Church in comparison with those of heretics. For instance, we may trace the growth in the expression of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity from the baptismal formula to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. This is growth, but absolute identity. So may we follow the doctrine of the Incarnation from the formula "The Word was made Flesh," to the full definitions of the Œcumenical Councils against Arians, Apollinarians, Nestorians and Eutychians. So too with the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament. Here again we have growth, but identity.

The same doctrines among heretics.

If now we test the same doctrines among schismatics and heretics, we find the doctrine of the Holy Trinity a series of heresies from Sabellius to Socinus; or we may trace the parodies of the doctrine of the Incarnation from Nestorius to Strauss, or of the Holy Eucharist from Luther to Zwinglius. Here is change indeed, but change in which identity is lost; the oak has mouldered and fallen to the ground. Only in the Church is there any certainty of truth.

II. Holy Scripture

Holy Scripture was not the first *fons* from which the Church's doctrine was drawn—*fons*, i.e., fountain or

stream, as distinguished from the *original source;* because that doctrine was fully revealed before the Canon of the Holy Scripture was authoritatively settled; for until the Second Council of Carthage in A.D. 397 there was no authorized Bible to refer to. The individual books which compose the New Testament were well known in the second century, but they were mingled with apocryphal writings—some of them of the most grotesque character—and some of these spurious writings were accepted and were even better known than some parts of the Word of God itself. But the Church, after having carefully investigated the books of the New Testament to see that they corresponded to her Traditions, put her imprimatur on them—probably in the Council of Carthage—and gave us the authorized Canon as we have it to-day. Some theologians, it is true, dispute this, but we can certainly trace our present Canon to that period.

not the first "fons."

The Protestant view that the Church rests on the Bible *only* is not only untrue as a doctrine but false as a fact; for the first four centuries, those of the Church's greatest purity, love, and zeal, embracing the age of the martyrs, was an age when there was no Bible as we understand the word to-day. The Holy Scripture was first a witness to the truth of the Church's Tradition, and then, when the Church had put her imprimatur on the Canon of the Holy Scripture, it became a *fons* from which the Church could draw her doctrines.

The Protestant view of the Bible false in fact.

Holy Scripture first a witness to the Church's doctrine, afterwards a "fons."

This at first sight may seem to be an argument in a circle, but when we examine it more closely we see that it is not so.

In the fourth century the function of the books of the New Testament was simply to show that the Tradition of the Church was identical with what had been

taught in the first century, when those books were written. The New Testament writings were, then, an *historical* and *contemporary* witness to the *facts* of the Church's history and to the *truths* which she taught immediately after her Lord's death, the earliest book having been written about A.D. 45, and the latest, the Gospel of S. John, just before the close of the first century. So that the books of the New Testament are historical *evidence* that the truths of the Church as taught in the fourth century were known and taught in the beginning of the Church's life. We must carefully observe that the value of their witness in this case does not in any way depend upon their authenticity or inspiration, but only on the fact that they were *genuine* writings of the first century.

Then the Church by her authoritative action separated the chaff from the wheat, and put her imprimatur on those books which now compose the New Testament, affirming that they are inspired, canonical, authentic, and are the Word of GOD. This she finally did in the Second Council of Carthage, A.D. 397. From this time they are a source from which the Church can prove that her doctrine as now taught existed from the beginning, and they also constitute the inspired record from which she proves that her doctrines are those taught by the infallible Word of GOD itself.

From the Council of Carthage, Scripture a source of the Church's doctrine.

We have therefore not only the Church's Tradition, the Living Voice of the Church, the HOLY SPIRIT, in all ages teaching truth, but we have as it were a commentary on this truth in that Word of GOD, the Bible, which was independently inspired by the same SPIRIT.

At the Reformation the German and Swiss Protestants, leaving Tradition, took the Bible as the basis of everything, and reversing the order of fact, made it the

Result of the Protestant view of the Bible.

sole source of doctrine, and, worst of all, interpreted it by private judgment. The result has been twofold: (1) the rise of countless sects that claim to have derived their religion from the Bible, each contradicting the others; and (2) the "higher" criticism of Protestant Germany, which destroys the Bible itself by the application of the right of private judgment; so that we see Bibliolatry, like other idolatries, leading to the ultimate destruction of the idol by the disgusted idolater.

The Church, however, first certifies to the authenticity and inspiration of the text, and then controls and guides its interpretation,—in both cases by the agency of the HOLY SPIRIT working through her theologians who are limited by her defined doctrines.

III. Human reason.

But strong as these two evidences are, we need a third witness; and this we have in human reason. There is not space in this work to discuss the various relationships between human reason and revelation, but it will suffice simply to point out one: that reason *in the individual* is in a sense the judge by which revealed religion is apprehended and tested.

The relation of reason and revelation.

The relation of reason to revealed truth is like the relation of the eye to light. Both light and the external objects which a man beholds exist objectively and independently of the eye, yet for man to apprehend them the eye must have the power of sight. So, while the truths of revelation exist independently of human reason, human reason first apprehends them and then passes judgment on them. It first apprehends them, and this apprehension must be not only passive but active.

But a man may have eyes, and yet refuse to look at certain objects to which his attention is directed. A man may have reason and refuse to investigate the

truths of revelation. This is the case with many—wilful blindness.

On examination revelation

When a man does turn his reason to the consideration of these truths, he finds that they commend themselves to his reason—that is, that no truth of revelation is in any sense contradictory to man's reason. Some truths may be *above* man's reason, in the sense that man could never by himself have attained to them; but when revealed to him, he finds that they are not contrary to reason.

i. commends itself to reason.

ii. offers a solution of many problems,

Again, he finds that the truths of revelation offer a solution of almost all the vexed problems of human life. As the scientist, in his investigation of nature, starts with his theory or working hypothesis and corrects it until he finds it answers all the conditions of the problem and is in harmony with all the observed phenomena, and then considers that his theory passes from the realm of hypothesis to that of scientific truth; so the reason finds, without any correction or modification, that the truths of revelation answer the conditions of the problem of human life and experience and are in perfect harmony with other knowledge, and so it accepts them as true.

iii. and satisfies man's cravings.

And lastly, man finds that these truths answer the cravings and needs of his own nature. So that the reason, having begun by being the judge, ends by being a witness to the truth of revelation; and man, having found the teaching of the Church true on all those points wherein he can test its truth, accepts that teaching as true also on those which are not contrary to reason, but above it, and where, therefore, reason can have no experience, and no evidence.

The answer to "What is truth?"

Thus we answer the question, "What is truth?" It is the revelation of GOD in CHRIST JESUS, trans-

mitted through the authoritative Voice of the Holy Catholic Church, witnessed to by the divine Scriptures, the inspired Word of God, tested by human reason, and satisfying human need.

What the teachings of the Church are.

But here an emphatic word of warning is needed in pointing out what are the teachings of the Catholic Church. They are not the speculations of individuals; nor the heresies of schismatical bodies which have separated from the Church. They are those truths only which the Church has taught everywhere, always, and which have been universally accepted.

There are many theories held by individual Christians, or even taught by individual theologians, which are in no sense the authoritative doctrine of the Church, and in no sense that revealed truth which is infallible.

As one looks back over the nineteen centuries of the Church's life, with all its varying struggles, one would expect to find, if the Church were a human institution, —what one finds in the history of philosophy and in all schismatical religions,—constant changes of view, varying theories regarding truth. But on the contrary one finds what is in itself a miracle—that, with all our increased knowledge in the present day, no truth which the Church has ever put forth authoritatively in Creed or Council, no truth which has been accepted throughout the whole Church, has ever been disproved.

Whither seekers after truth are led.

Every good man must be a seeker after truth, and so the trend of human thought has been and is an attempt to answer the question "What is truth?" and it ever will be so, until man is able to destroy in his nature the thirst for knowledge,—which he cannot do without ceasing to be man. For a time a man may satisfy his mind with the husks, dwelling on secondary causes,

pursuing truth and being constantly halted by impenetrable darkness; but if a man is worth anything he cannot, except at the cost of intellectual suicide, stop here. Is there an alternative? Is there anything else? The Greek philosophers held that unless a god came down from Heaven to reveal it, truth would never be reached by the human intellect. The Christian religion tells us that GOD did come down from Heaven and reveal truth; that on the last night of His earthly life, in bidding farewell to His disciples, JESUS said, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life"; and that on the next day, when standing before His human judge, He proclaimed, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth" (S. John xiv. 6; xviii. 37).

Does the Church's teaching satisfy?

And the truth which He here proclaims is the teaching of the Holy Catholic Church. On what is it founded? How is it proved? Does it answer the problems of human life? Does it satisfy man's intellect, and man's heart? What is the testimony of those who have studied it, who have known it, who have lived by it? Has it ended, like all other teachings, like the philosophies of the world, in disappointment? Does it undertake to give what man so craves for,—the knowledge of good and evil? To all these questions a countless throng of witnesses through all the ages answer, that in the Catholic Faith, the teaching of the Church, they have found all that they sought, sufficient knowledge of "good and evil."

The Catholic Faith the revelation of CHRIST. i. Perpetuated by Tradition.

For the Catholic Faith is the revelation of GOD to man in JESUS CHRIST, Who was perfect GOD and perfect Man, *perpetuated* and preserved free from error by the Living Voice of the HOLY GHOST Who dwells in the Mystical Body of CHRIST, the Holy Catholic

Church; *witnessed* to by the Holy Scriptures, which are the infallible Word of GOD; and *accepted* by human reason as the clear utterance of that truth which unaided man groped after but could not adequately express, as the solution of the mysterious problems of his existence, and as the satisfaction of the cravings of his nature.

ii. Witnessed to by Holy Scripture.
iii. Accepted by human reason.

A threefold cord is not easily broken; so the teachings of the Church are impregnable because their Source, the Revelation of GOD, is infallible.

Conclusion: a threefold cord not easily broken.

CHAPTER VIII.

GRACE AND THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

Introductory.

OF the four great spheres in which the Church claims absolute authority, three, truth, morals and worship, were discussed in Chapter VI. One therefore still remains, Grace, a sphere so great and so important, that to its consideration almost all the remaining chapters of this book must be more or less devoted.

The Church the dispenser of grace.

The Church claims not only to teach man what is true, and what is right, and how to worship GOD, but claims to be, by CHRIST'S ordinance, the dispenser of that grace which alone can enable man to believe what is true, to do what is right, and to attain his true end,—to serve GOD acceptably here, and to live with GOD happily hereafter.

Judaism taught truth and morals.

The Mosaic dispensation, so far as it went, was a revelation of truth and morals and the law of worship; and the Jew had no reason to complain that he did not know the law of GOD, which was holy, just and good; but he found by bitter experience that knowing the law he had not strength to obey it.

Christianity distinguished from all other religions by its claim to dispense "grace."

In the spheres of truth, morals, and worship the Church of CHRIST differs from that of the Old Covenant only in degree. That which absolutely differentiates Christianity from Judaism, and all other religions,

is that it is the dispenser of grace. As Holy Scripture says, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by JESUS CHRIST" (S. John i. 17). The Church claims not only to show man the way to Heaven but also to give him power to make the journey, to enlighten his intellect, and to strengthen his will, that he may be able to say with S. Paul, "I can do all things through CHRIST Which strengtheneth me" (Phil. iv. 13).

Grace the fruit of the Incarnation and Atonement.

Grace is the fruit of the Incarnation and Atonement. For by the Incarnation and Atonement our Blessed Lord merited for man all forms of grace, and this grace is chiefly dispensed (through the Ministry of the Church) to those individuals who seek it in the appointed channels of the Sacraments. There is, of course, besides this a direct bestowal of grace in response to prayer and good works. By the death of CHRIST the human race, which in Adam had fallen from its state of righteousness, was restored to that grace and glory which had been lost by the Fall. For the supernatural end of man is the life of glory or the Beatific Vision, and it is by *grace* that he is prepared for this end. So that grace is, as it were, the principle and beginning, but glory the end and consummation, of man as restored by CHRIST.

Grace the preparation for glory.

The difference between the natural and supernatural man is "grace."

By this precious effusion of grace into the world as many as receive it are lifted again to the supernatural state. For "as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of GOD" (S. John i. 12). The difference therefore between the natural and supernatural man is *grace*. By grace man is in Baptism elevated to the supernatural state, and though by wilful sin he may forfeit the privileges of that state, he cannot lose the character it confers.

In Christian life grace permeates every action.

In the Christian life grace is present always, and permeates every action that is worthy of being called a Christian act, as done for love of CHRIST; for while it is untrue to say with Luther that all works not done in the power of grace are sins and so are displeasing to GOD, yet it is true that no work is meritorious, and therefore pleasing to GOD, which is not done through grace.

The order of grace.

The whole of this economy, including all calls and movements of man to the supernatural end of glory, is what we mean by the order of grace, since the divine impulse by which man is elevated and led to that end is grace. Grace, then, restored the human race to a new state, which is sometimes called a state of "repaired" nature, since it is built upon the "fallen" nature.

Greatness of the subject.

The subject of grace is so great that a volume might be written on it. Here, however, we must confine ourselves to such brief discussion of the principal theological divisions of grace as may enable us to understand clearly the doctrine of the Church in regard to the Sacraments. And in these divisions we must carefully bear in mind that they are not so much divisions of grace itself as different aspects of the work of grace in us.

I. Grace.

1. Definition of grace.

i. In worldly usage.

ii. Theologically.

(1) In the most general sense.

The word grace is employed in many senses. In the usage of the world it describes elegance of movement or speech, sometimes favour and good-will, sometimes gratitude or thanksgiving. Theologically it is used in the *most general* sense for every *free* gift that is not *due* to a *person* or to *personal* merit, although it may in some sense be due to the *nature*, as, for instance, free-will belongs to human nature, and yet it is GOD'S free gift and therefore comes under the head of grace in this most general sense.

In a more restricted and definite sense grace is any free gift which is preternatural, that is, not due even to the *nature*, as immortality in the first man, for man is not by nature immortal. (2) In a restricted sense.

But in the *strict* sense grace is a supernatural gift freely bestowed by GOD on a rational creature, and pertaining in some way to eternal life. It is in this last sense that the word is ordinarily used in theology. Grace taken in this strict sense may be regarded in its operations from many points of view. (3) In the strict sense. 2. Divisions of grace.

It is usually distinguished as the grace of the "first state" (or unfallen nature) and grace of the "second state" (or fallen nature) which latter may be defined as the supernatural influence of GOD bestowed through the merits of CHRIST on fallen man in order to fit him for life eternal. i. Grace of the "first state" and of the "second state,"

Some theologians call the grace of the first state the grace of GOD, as distinct from the grace of the second state which they call the grace of CHRIST, because given only through His merits. But it is more probable that all grace, whether given to angels or men, as well in the unfallen as in the fallen state, must be attributed to the merits of CHRIST, and therefore considered the grace of CHRIST. This would certainly be the opinion of all Scotists, and indeed of most theologians. Or the grace of GOD and the grace of CHRIST.

In regard to its *end* grace is twofold: (1) "Gratia gratis data" and (2) "Gratia gratum faciens." The first is that which is given to man principally for the salvation of others, and can exist even when the recipient is in mortal sin, as the power to work miracles, or those gifts of the priesthood which even an unworthy priest possesses. The other is that which is given chiefly for a man's own sanctification, and is ii. Gratia gratis data, and gratum faciens.

called "gratum faciens" because it makes a man pleasing or acceptable to GOD. These two aspects of grace have been called in English respectively "gratuitous" and "grateful," but all grace is gratuitous, and the second term, "grateful," has in common use the sense of thankful rather than pleasing; it is therefore better, with this explanation, to leave these terms in their Latin forms.

iii. Uncreated and Created grace.

In regard to *itself* grace is called (1) Uncreated, and (2) Created. *Uncreated* grace is GOD Himself, in so far as GOD gives Himself when He communicates Himself to His creatures. Such is the love of GOD towards us, or the love by which GOD loved us from eternity, which love is at the same time GOD Himself, and the principle of every gift which GOD bestows upon us in time. Such was also the Incarnation and the outpouring of the HOLY GHOST at Pentecost, which are called "grace" both by Holy Scripture (Tit. ii. 11) and the Fathers. *Created* grace is a created gift distinct from GOD; such would be actual and sanctifying grace.

iv. External and Internal Grace.

In regard to its *manner of action* grace may be described as (1) External, and (2) Internal. *External* grace affects man only from without, as the preaching of the Gospel, the miracles and example of CHRIST. *Internal* grace affects man from within; and all Sacramental grace is internal in its operations.

v. Habitual and Actual grace.

In regard to its *object* this internal grace is distinguished into (1) Habitual and (2) Actual grace. That grace is called *habitual*, which is an abiding habit or quality in the soul of man, rendering him righteous and pleasing to GOD. Habitual grace is also spoken of as Sanctifying grace or Justifying grace, and to it are joined "infused virtues," and gifts of the Holy Spirit, which may be regarded as properties connatural

with grace. *Actual* grace is a special grace imparted by way of isolated or transient action for a special purpose.

vi. The "first grace" and the "second grace."

Habitual or sanctifying grace is subdivided into (1) the "first grace" and (2) the "second grace. The *first* grace is that which makes the *sinner* righteous. It is conferred in the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance, which are called the Sacraments of the dead, since they convey the "first grace" to a soul which is dead in sin. The first grace is therefore the gift of spiritual life to the soul. The *second* grace, which is conferred by all the other Sacraments (and in other ways) causes an increase of habitual grace and makes the righteous man more holy.

vii. Divisions of actual grace. (1) Illumination and inspiration.

Actual grace has many divisions.

In regard to its immediate *end*, it gives illumination and inspiration.

(2) Grace of the intellect and will.

Considered from the point of view of its immediate *subject*, the same grace is spoken of as the grace of the intellect and the grace of the will. These two divisions, however, are practically the same, the one having regard to the effect produced, illumination or inspiration; the other to the faculty affected, the intellect or the will.

(3) Medicinal and Elevating grace.

In regard to the *effect* it produces, grace is said to be Medicinal or Elevating. (1) Medicinal grace heals the weakness of our nature by strengthening it. (2) Elevating grace raises our actions from the natural to the supernatural order. For instance, an act in itself good, such as giving alms, if done from mere natural impulse is but a natural act, and therefore not meritorious. But the same act, if done under the influence of grace, is raised to the supernatural order, and is one of those treasures which we lay up for ourselves in Heaven.

Looked at with respect to the consent of man's free-

(4) Exciting, Operating or Prevailing, and Assisting, Co-operating or Accompanying grace.

will, grace may be spoken of as (1) Exciting, Operating or Prevailing grace, and (2) Assisting, Co-operating or Accompanying grace. In each case the three terms are nearly synonymous.

Exciting grace consists sometimes in that illumination of the intellect, sometimes in that movement of the will, which GOD produces in us, as it were physically, and without any moral or free action on our part, exciting us to will or do some good act. Assisting grace consists in that supernatural aid, by which GOD concurs with us as we act freely, and influences us in each and every supernatural and voluntary act.

viii. Sufficient and Efficient grace.

Exciting grace regarded *in its result* is called (1) Sufficient and (2) Efficient grace. Sufficient grace is that grace which GOD gives to every man, and which, if he uses it, is *sufficient* for his salvation. Efficient grace is that fullest gift of grace, which actually *effects* its purpose, the recipient's salvation, but without overriding his free-will. With these explanations of grace we are now in a position to consider theologically the Sacraments of the Church.

II. The Sacraments the chief means of grace.

1. Definition, etc. of "sacrament."

The chief means of grace are the Sacraments. The word "sacrament" has been variously defined, most briefly perhaps as "an outward sign of an inward grace, ordained by CHRIST Himself either directly or mediately through His Apostles;" and most fully by Hugo of St. Victor: "A sacrament is something material, from its institution signifying, and by resemblance representing, and from its sanctification containing, spiritual grace." Our Catechism defines it as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by CHRIST Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

History of "sacrament."

The history of the word sacrament is interesting. Pitisco shows that "sacramentum" was used in many senses by the Romans, but always with the idea of *religious sanction*. First, by a law of L. Papinius, both parties in a lawsuit were required to deposit a certain sum of money with the priests, and he who won the suit received his money back again, while the deposit of the loser was used in providing public sacrifices. Again, "sacramentum" was the word used for the oath by which the Roman soldier bound himself to be faithful to his commander, as distinguished from the civil oath, "jusjurandum." It was also the oath by which members of corporations or societies bound themselves to their mutual obligations.

Its earliest application to the Christian Sacraments is probably to be found in the epistle of Pliny to Trajan, A.D. 104, where he said that Christians bound themselves by an oath (*sacramento*) not to commit any crime, etc. It is very striking that a heathen should have anticipated the later terminology of the Christian Church.

"Mystery" as its equivalent.

The word used by the Greek Church is "mystery" (*μυστήριον*). It points in the first place to the discipline of secrecy which was observed in the instruction of catechumens for Baptism; then to that feeling of awe which is excited by objects of great solemnity; and thirdly, to the realization that in the Mystery there is more than the mind of man can grasp.

Wider use of "sacrament" until the twelfth century.

In the early Church, however, the use of the word "sacrament," was by no means confined to what we now call Sacraments. For example, S. Cyprian speaks of the practice of morning prayer as a sacrament. In the twelfth century the word had come to have its present limitations, for we then find Peter Lombard

enumerating the seven Sacraments without any indication that he was teaching a novelty; and from that time the limitation was accepted by the Church both in the East and West.

Sacraments channels of grace.

It is scarcely necessary to observe that Sacraments are not mere empty signs or symbols of something which is absent. They are the channels by which the spiritual gift is conveyed to our souls, and, as our Catechism says, "a pledge to assure us thereof." The Christian Sacraments, therefore, do not merely signify grace; they actually *confer* it.

They confer grace ex opere operato,

Hence they are called "effectual" signs of grace. Their action is "ex opere operato," not "ex opere operantis." The phrase "opus operatum," which seems to have been first used in the twelfth century by Peter of Poictiers and afterwards by Innocent III., implies that the efficacy of the action of the Sacraments does not depend on anything human, but solely on the will of GOD as expressed by CHRIST'S institution and promise.

and not ex opere operantis.

The other phrase, "opus operantis," which implies that the action of the Sacrament depends on the worthiness either of the recipient or of the minister, is contrary to the constitution of the Church. This is shown (1) by S. Augustine, in answer to the Donatists, who made the efficacy of the Sacraments depend on the worthiness of the minister; and (2) by all Catholic theologians against the Calvinistic view, which makes it depend on the faith of the recipient.

Sacraments typified in Mosaic Law.

The Christian Sacraments were foreshadowed in the Mosaic Law; for instance, Baptism by the rite of circumcision, and the Holy Eucharist by the sacrifices, especially that of the Passover; on which account these Jewish ceremonies are sometimes called the Sacraments of the Old Law.

Their number limited to seven.

The number of the Sacraments is universally held to be seven, although probably there was no agreement on this point much before the twelfth century. Both the Greek and the Roman Churches enumerate seven Sacraments. Our Church in the twenty-fifth Article does the same, though it distinguishes between the two Sacraments called "Sacraments of the Gospel" which are generally necessary to salvation, and the other five.

GOD is their Author.

The Author of the Sacraments is GOD. No material rite could possibly be capable of conferring grace except through an act of the Divine Will. Not even CHRIST considered only as Man had power to institute a Sacrament. But as the SON of GOD made Man, having redeemed man by the Sacrifice of His Death and made satisfaction for the sins of the world, He merited grace for that humanity which He had assumed. He therefore, received power to institute Sacraments as instruments by which the grace which He earned for men is applied to them individually. And so He says when referring to the Sacrament of Baptism, "All power is given unto Me in Heaven and in earth" (S. Matt. xxviii. 18).

The Church only their dispenser.

Since no external rite can have the power of conferring grace except by the institution of GOD, it follows that there is no power in the Church, acting on her own account, to institute a Sacrament. The Church can neither make new Sacraments, nor in any way change those which CHRIST has instituted; although she may ordain the ceremonies which shall be used in their ministration.

2. The essentials of a Sacrament.

For every Sacrament four things are required: (1) the matter, (2) the form, (3) the minister, and (4) the subject. In Holy Matrimony, however, the contracting parties are both ministers and subjects of the Sac-

rament, and the same is true of the priest who makes his Communion at the Mass which he is celebrating.

i. and ii. Matter and form.

The *matter* is the outward sign ; the *form* that which determines the matter to its special use or purpose. For instance, water may exist indifferently for many purposes, to quench thirst, or to cleanse ; but in Baptism the use of the form, or words ordained by CHRIST, determines that particular water to be "the laver of regeneration." This idea is extended to immaterial things, as, for instance, the matter in Penance, which consists of the dispositions required in the subject.

iii. The minister.

Every Sacrament must have as its minister a living human being. In Baptism this is the only qualification required ; that is, in cases of *necessity* a lay person, whether man or woman, can baptize. Such Baptism is valid, though irregular if done without necessity. In Matrimony any *baptized* man and woman who are capable of intermarriage can and do administer the Sacrament of Matrimony to each other. The priest simply witnesses the contract as the Church's representative, and bestows the Church's benediction on the union ; so that a priest does not, strictly speaking, "marry" people, but solemnizes their marriage. In the other five Sacraments it is necessary that the minister should be in valid Orders.

The intention of the minister.

The minister must have the intention of doing what the Church does. This does not require even that he should have faith, but only that he should intend to fulfil, at least virtually, the Church's intention. Thus an infidel priest celebrating Mass must intend to do what the Church does, although he may not have any faith in the doctrine of the Church regarding the Holy Eucharist.

The question of intention is a very vexed one, as seen in the various opinions held by theologians of repute, none of which has been condemned. Bellarmine says in effect that it is sufficient that the minister having valid Orders should mean to do what the Church does, though he belong to a false church, thinking it the true one. If he intends to do what it prescribes, it is sufficient, because he thinks it a part of the true Church; and the error of the minister does not hinder the efficacy of the Sacrament, though the Sacrament would be invalidated by his lack of intention. Catharinus considers that it is enough for validity if the minister merely performs the external rite of the Sacrament in a serious manner, even if internally he withhold his intention. Bossuet says that a sufficient intention consists in the "will on the part of the minister seriously to perform the rites prescribed by the Church, and to do nothing calculated to show a contrary intention, which intention he himself cannot make void by any secret intention whatsoever."

iv. The subject.

The subject, or recipient of a Sacrament must be a living human being. For all Sacraments except Baptism, he must be baptized, and, as a general rule, must have some kind of intention to receive the benefit of the Sacrament. Certain apparent exceptions to this will be explained when we treat of the particular Sacraments under which they fall.

v. Dispositions.

For the efficacy of the Sacrament in the individual there must be right dispositions. These will be considered when we treat of particular Sacraments.

3. Classification:

The Sacraments may be divided in three ways.

i. Of the living and of the dead.

Firstly, they are distinguished as Sacraments "of the living," and Sacraments "of the dead." Sacraments of the living are those which depend for their efficacy,

as distinct from their *validity*, upon the recipient being in a state of grace. They are five: Holy Eucharist, Confirmation, Holy Orders, Matrimony, and Unction. Sacraments of the dead act when there is no grace in the soul (except prevenient grace); they are two: Baptism and Penance. These two convey the "first grace," the other five convey the "second grace."

ii. Those which impress character, and those which do not.

Secondly, there are some Sacraments which impress "character," and some which do not. Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders, which can be received but once, imprint upon the soul of the recipient an indelible mark. This mark is called "character," from the Greek word which signifies something carved or engraven on a durable substance. It is also called "the seal" (Eph. i. 13; iv. 30; 2 Cor. i. 22). The character may be considered as the mark which indicates the recipient's *position* in CHRIST'S Church, the Kingdom of Heaven. The character of Baptism indicates that he is a child of GOD; of Confirmation, a soldier of CHRIST; of Holy Orders, a priest of GOD'S Church. These characters are indelible and eternal. If a soul so stamped be lost, the character will add to its confusion in hell; if saved, it will shine forth in Heaven. These three Sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders, since they cannot be repeated are said to *revive*. That is to say, if they are received without right dispositions by one, for instance, who is in mortal sin and not penitent, the character is impressed and the gift is received, though the latter remains unappropriated. But if at any time the obstacle is removed by penitence, the gift begins to work. The same is true also of Matrimony, as regards the *reviving* of the grace given, though it does not convey character, and so may be repeated. But it is an act of grievous sacrilege to

repeat any of *the three* Sacraments which convey character. The other Sacraments, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Unction, and, as we have said, Matrimony, do not convey character.

iii. Those which are *generally* necessary.

Thirdly, some Sacraments are "generally necessary to salvation," and others, while necessary in some cases, are not universally so. Our Catechism places under the first head the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, which it says are "generally" (or universally) "necessary to salvation."

This, however, is not an entirely accurate statement. Baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation, for a person can have no life who has not been born. This is called the "*necessitas medii*," since Baptism is the means by which the supernatural life is given to the soul and the individual is incorporated into CHRIST. But by virtue of this union with CHRIST we *mystically* feed upon His Flesh and Blood, though not, strictly speaking, by a sacramental act, but to our soul's health. Hence it is "that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved," since they have received the gift of life by Baptism, and have been enabled to "eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood" by virtue of their incorporation into His Body.

If it be said that the Holy Eucharist is generally necessary to salvation, it must mean that without the help of that Sacrament salvation would be so difficult to attain as to be practically impossible. This is called the "*necessitas precepti*," because it is the express command of CHRIST, and to disregard such a command would be extremely dangerous.

From this it follows that sectarians, who have no valid Eucharist but who die in a state of grace, will be

saved, not by the uncovenanted mercies of GOD, but through sacramental grace,—the grace of their Baptism, if they have preserved it, and also probably the grace of *spiritual Communion*,—where their religious errors have been caused by invincible ignorance.

Those which are not generally necessary.

The twenty-fifth Article of Religion places the other five Sacraments in a lower class, and gives as its reason "that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of GOD." They are not necessary to salvation in the same sense as the two greater Sacraments, since they are not necessary for every one. Confirmation is the completion of Baptism, and though the gifts of the HOLY GHOST which it confers are of immense help to the Christian in his warfare in this world, they are not *absolutely* necessary and cannot always be obtained, as, for instance, by those who have grown up in a country where there is no Bishop within their reach. Penance is only absolutely necessary for those who have fallen into mortal sin; Holy Orders and Matrimony for those individual Christians only whom GOD has called to the priesthood or the married life; and the grace of Extreme Unction is not of such a character as to be generally necessary to salvation.

4. Sacramentals.

In the early Church, as we have seen, the word "sacrament" had a very wide meaning, and was applied to a great variety of pious practices. From the twelfth century the term was restricted to the seven rites which contain and convey grace. Many of the pious practices referred to, such as the sign of the Cross, prayer said in certain places and at certain times, holy water, etc., were now called "Sacramentals."

This term is used to distinguish them from the Sacraments proper. For while the Church has no power

whatever to institute a Sacrament (that is, a rite which contains and confers grace, and which can only be instituted by GOD Himself), yet she does possess the power of connecting grace with certain outward observances in virtue of prayer offered by her ministers in her name, according to the principle which we see set forth in the prayer made by Solomon at the dedication of his Temple (1 Kings viii. 22–53), where special efficacy is connected with prayer said in the Temple.

Sanctifying grace.

"Sanctifying grace" is that grace which is given by all the Sacraments in common. Sometimes it is considered as a distinct habit infused into the soul, preparing it to receive the other graces peculiar to the different Sacraments. But more often it is regarded as the habit of charity. Sanctifying grace gives an increase of the habitual grace of charity, so that when a Sacrament is rightly received, in addition to the "special grace" which *belongs only* to that Sacrament, there is also an increase in the "habitual grace" of the soul.

Sacramental grace.

"The grace of the Sacrament," or Sacramental grace, is a special grace which is peculiar to the particular Sacrament; that is to say, it is the grace for the imparting of which the particular Sacrament was instituted. For instance, the grace of the Sacrament in Baptism is regeneration; in Confirmation, it is a special gift of the HOLY GHOST.

Thus we see that the special office of the Church is the ministration of the Sacraments, because they are the channels through which the graces merited by CHRIST through the Incarnation and Atonement are conveyed to individual souls to supply their special needs.

CHAPTER IX.

BAPTISM.

Introductory.

The consequences of the Fall.

WE have seen that man was created, as it were, outside GOD, and that by his disobedience he lost the gift of original righteousness bestowed upon him by GOD, and fell under the dominion of sin; and further, that by virtue of the obedience of the Incarnate SON atonement was made for the sins of the world, and CHRIST became the Fountain of grace,

Their remedy.

and thus supplied all man's needs. "Of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by JESUS CHRIST" (S. John i. 16, 17).

Affecting human nature.

Hence by the Incarnation and Atonement of CHRIST human nature as a whole was taken into GOD and as a whole was saved. But man is an individual being, not merely a part of the race, and man's sins and

And applied to individuals.

man's needs are all of them individual sins, individual needs. It therefore became necessary that some means should be instituted by which the individual members of the race might be brought into relation with the infinite and inexhaustible reservoir of grace which flows from the merits of CHRIST. And these means are the Sacraments of CHRIST'S Holy Church.

I. Baptism.

The first of them and the most necessary is the Sacrament of Holy Baptism,—first in order of time, be-

cause no other Sacraments can be received until the soul has had impressed upon it the baptismal character, and has been admitted into the covenanted sphere of grace; first in the order of its nature, for it is the new birth, the beginning of the supernatural life; and most necessary, for without Baptism none can enter Heaven (S. John iii. 3 and 5).

The teaching of ancient theologians.

Lancelotti sums up the teaching of ancient theology concerning Baptism in these words: "Baptism is an outward washing of the body, which, with the aid of a certain form of words, designates and works an inward ablution of the soul. For as circumcision in the people of GOD, instituted for a seal of faith and righteousness, availed to infants to mark the purgation of original sin, so also Baptism begins to avail to the renewing of man. Nor yet from the moment a man is baptized is all the old infirmity forthwith consumed in him, but his renewing begins to the remission of sins, and to the understanding and operation of spiritual things. But the rest is in hope until it be indeed accomplished, which will be at the Resurrection. Although full remission of sins takes place in Baptism, there doth not therefore ensue complete newness and change."

Three modes of Baptism.

The Church recognizes three modes of Baptism: the Baptism of Water, of Blood, and of Desire.

1. Baptism of water.

The Baptism of water, is the ordinary mode of Baptism, ordained by CHRIST Himself.

2. Of blood.

The second mode is known as the Baptism of blood; for it is the constant teaching of the Church that all who suffer martyrdom for CHRIST attain remission of all sin and punishment, and therefore are admitted to Heaven.

3. Of desire.

That the desire for Baptism may suffice for salvation when the Sacrament is unattainable may be gathered

from a sermon of S. Ambrose, preached at Milan, A.D. 392, at the funeral of the Emperor Valentinian II.

Explicitly illustrated by the case of Valentinian II.

Valentinian was the victim of the unfortunate practice of deferring Baptism. He was on his way from Gaul to receive this Sacrament at the hands of S. Ambrose when he was murdered at Vienne. S. Ambrose, who represents the belief of his time, points out that as he had certainly desired the grace of which Baptism is the appointed channel, and had prayed for it, it was not to be doubted that he received what he prayed for. Piety and a good intention, he says, gained for him what the martyrs gained by shedding their blood.

Implicit desire discussed.

The desire of Baptism in Valentinian was, of course, explicit, but it is held by some theologians, that an *implicit* desire may suffice. S. Augustine in his treatise on Baptism distinguishes between the Sacrament itself and that turning of the heart to GOD which ordinarily is required for salvation, and contends that where both these conditions cannot be secured, either will suffice.

Case of infants.

Of adults.

Thus a baptized infant is saved without conversion of heart, and a man who really turns to GOD may be saved without Baptism, where it cannot be had, provided that he does not despise that Sacrament. This desire of Baptism must be accompanied with a real love of GOD, and sorrow for sin, which cannot exist without the desire to fulfil all GOD'S commands and therefore implicitly that command which requires men to receive Baptism.

Of Quakers.

Some have thought that Quakers may have received the Baptism of desire, since, while rejecting the outward ordinance through invincible prejudice, they desire what they call "the Baptism of the SPIRIT," by which they mean all that the Baptism of desire implicitly covers. This is *merely a theological opinion*,

and it would be most dangerous for any one himself to neglect Baptism on this account, for it would show that he had no implicit desire for Baptism. But it may be held as a probable and comfortable doctrine when applied only to others.

Difference between man in a state of nature and of grace.

Before we proceed to the discussion of the Sacrament of Baptism it is important that we should clearly grasp the difference between the two states in which man exists in this world, the state of nature and the state of grace, or the natural state and the supernatural.

State of nature.

Man is born into the world in the state of nature. (Some theologians would object to this phrase on the ground that man's original nature was that of Adam before the Fall, and would say that man is now born into the world in what is usually called a state of *fallen* nature. Therefore, in using the term "nature," it is to be understood in this latter sense.)

State of grace.

In the state of nature man has natural gifts, natural powers, natural hopes, a natural end. When by Baptism he becomes incorporated into CHRIST, he is in a state of grace, and all these things become changed. The natural is not destroyed, but is lifted up into a higher plane. Man's gifts, powers, hopes, and end all become supernatural, as also his needs; and the difference between the natural man and the supernatural is a difference too great to be expressed in words.

The teaching of CHRIST.

This is not a mere theological opinion, but the express teaching of our Lord Himself, for after saying to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and of the SPIRIT, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of GOD," He went on to say, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the SPIRIT is spirit" (S. John iii. 5, 6). He drew the distinction absolutely, and stated that those who were born of the

flesh only,—that is, in the "natural" state,—could neither see nor enter into the Kingdom of GOD until they had been "born of water and SPIRIT."

Statement by S. Paul.

S. Paul also teaches the same when he says that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of GOD" (1 Cor. xv. 50).

Objection of Nicodemus.

We may observe that Nicodemus made his objection, and asked for an explanation of our Lord's meaning, "How can a man be born when he is old?" Our Lord replied, "That which is born of the flesh is *flesh*," that is, the *natural* man, with natural faculties, intellect, memory, will, and a natural end; and "that which is born of the SPIRIT is *spirit*," the *spiritual* man with the natural faculties illumined by grace, and possessing in addition the infused gifts of faith, hope, and love, with all the gifts of the HOLY GHOST. The two things are as distinct as earth and Heaven, as flesh and spirit. This is the explicit teaching of our Lord Himself.

Man's possibilities in a state of nature.

In the state of nature man has not only natural gifts, but also a certain relation to GOD, the relation of the creature to its Creator. He can know something about GOD and, in a feeble sort of way, he can love GOD; but he has no possibility of entering the Kingdom of Heaven, no capacity for seeing GOD.

Case of an unbaptized adult.

Here the question suggests itself, Are all unbaptized persons, then, lost? Before replying categorically yes or no, we must explain clearly what we mean by "lost." If we mean by lost that they can never see GOD in Heaven, we must answer, yes; for that is what our Lord JESUS CHRIST says. If we mean by lost that they are in the torments of hell, no; unless they have sinned against the light of nature; for it is quite possible for a man who is unbaptized, but who lives a

good life according to his knowledge and light, to enjoy in eternity what we call "natural beatitude," that is, the happiness of all his natural faculties. He may know something of GOD, though he cannot see Him; he may love GOD, though he cannot be with Him; he may have a far greater joy than is possible to anyone in this world. But natural beatitude is not the sight of GOD in Heaven, it is not the Beatific Vision.

Unbaptized infants.

It may not be amiss here to consider a kindred question,—the condition of children who, from no fault of their own, die without Baptism. Are they, too, shut out from the Vision of GOD?

Upon this point it must be carefully observed that the Church has never given any decision. Among theologians, however, there have been various opinions. One is that children whose parents had the desire that they should be baptized, but who by mere accident were not baptized, have the Baptism of desire. This, however, is very improbable.

Another theory, a mere opinion, is that these children are baptized by angels, where the fault is not their own, just before their death. This, again, is most improbable.

And then there is the most usual opinion, that these children do not see GOD, but that they are in great joy in the Limbus Infantum. "Limbus" is a word which means "fringe," and when we talk about people in natural beatitude being in "*Limbus*," we mean that they are in the fringe between heaven and hell, and that they are certainly not in any pain, though they are certainly not in Heaven.

Opinion of S. Thomas.

S. Thomas says of such children that they do not grieve because they do not see GOD, any more than a bird grieves because it cannot be a king. They rejoice,

he says, because they share in GOD'S goodness and know many natural perfections. Other theologians say they know and love GOD by means of their natural powers, but while they have natural happiness they have not the sight of GOD, they are not in Heaven.

Case of S. John Baptist.

We may see this more clearly by considering a very ancient interpretation of our Lord's words in regard to S. John Baptist: "Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he" (S. Matt. xi. 11). S. John's was the very climax of all Old Testament sanctity. As far as goodness was concerned his life was the life of a saint; as regards faith, he believed in our Lord with his whole heart and soul; and as regards love, he died a martyr for the truth. And yet our Lord says the least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he. The least baptized child! What did our Lord mean? He did not mean that such a child was greater in faith, or goodness, or love. He did not mean that its sanctity was greater at all in degree, but greater in *kind*, because the least baptized child is a member of CHRIST, and S. John Baptist, with all his goodness, was not.

There are some people who say "all you need is to be good"; but who was better than S. John?—or, "all you want is faith"; but who had greater faith than he?—or, "the one thing necessary is love"; but who better proved his love than the Baptist, who died a martyr's death? And yet the sanctity of the least baptized child is greater than S. John's in kind not in degree, because the baptized child is incorporated into CHRIST, and S. John was not.

The Sacrament of Baptism.

We are now in a position to consider the teaching of the Church about the Sacrament of Baptism.

All theologians agree that Baptism was not of general obligation, nor its gifts actually *operative*, till after our Lord's Resurrection. For in this, as in all Sacraments, the HOLY GHOST is the agent, and He did not descend upon the Church till Pentecost. There are, however, but few who also refer the *institution* of Baptism to that period.

II. Its institution.

Most theologians, following S. Thomas, hold that this Sacrament was instituted by our Lord, and administered by His Apostles, some time before His death.

This opinion S. Augustine and other Fathers commend as more probable. The two chief arguments on which it is founded are :

1. The words of Holy Scripture, "The Pharisees had heard that JESUS made and baptized more disciples than John, though JESUS Himself baptized not, but His disciples" (S. John iv. 1, 2). This they say was not merely the baptism of John, but another baptism, as is here implied, and more distinctly declared by S. John himself when he said, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but . . . He shall baptize you with the HOLY GHOST and with fire" (S. Matt. iii. 11).

2. If Baptism was not instituted before the death of our Lord we must admit,—what is most improbable,—that the Apostles received both the Holy Eucharist and the Sacrament of Holy Orders before they were baptized.

S. Augustine, commenting on the words, "Though JESUS Himself baptized not, but His disciples," says that although it is not stated in Holy Scripture, yet

we must believe that CHRIST Himself baptized the Apostles. And Nicephorus quotes from Evodius of Antioch a tradition that our Lord baptized His Blessed Mother and S. Peter, and that S. Peter baptized his brother Andrew, S. John, and S. James, who baptized the others.

There is no absolute agreement in regard to the exact time of its institution; the more common opinion, however, is that our Lord at least partially instituted Baptism, and by His example outlined the Sacrament when He was Himself baptized by S. John. For then the waters received from CHRIST'S touch their sanctification, that they might be made fit *matter* for Baptism. There also the *form* of Baptism was indicated in the manifestation of the Holy Trinity, while its peculiar *effect* was declared from the opened Heaven by the Voice of the FATHER, "This is my Beloved SON, in Whom I am well pleased." So that all that pertains to the institution is found outlined in this mystery, and this sketch our Lord soon after filled out by the positive institution of the Sacrament of Baptism.

All Sacraments require four things: matter, form, a minister, and a subject.

1. Matter. The *matter* of Baptism is twofold: remote and proximate; the *remote* matter being water, the *proximate* matter the application of the water to the subject. This proximate matter was ordinarily applied by immersion; but this is not the only method, since affusion or even sprinkling is sufficient.

In the second century we find the sufficiency of sprinkling or "aspersion," implied in the book of the Didaché of the Apostles. In the third century S. Cyprian speaks of it as an alternative mode of Baptism. And considering that in the case of infants and the sick

immersion could not have been used with safety, it is highly probable that affusion or aspersion has occasionally been in use from the first. Since the fourteenth century it has certainly prevailed as the *ordinary* method of Baptism in the Western Church. It is to be observed that sufficient water should be poured to cause it to flow upon the person. Aspersion, therefore, should not be used, lest there should be a doubt about the contact of the water with the person.

2. Form.

The *form* in Baptism, as ordained by CHRIST Himself, consists in the words expressing the intention to baptize in the Name of the FATHER and of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST. In the West it is, "I baptize thee in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST." The Easterns use the passive form, "the servant of CHRIST is baptized in the Name," etc.

Some few theologians have thought that perhaps this is not absolutely essential, because we read in the Acts of the Apostles that converts were baptized in the Name of JESUS CHRIST (Acts ii. 38, viii. 12, and x. 48), or "in the name of the Lord JESUS" (Acts xix. 5); but probably these words simply describe Christian Baptism as distinguished from the various similar rites in use among the Jews. At any rate such a form, even if valid, would be unlawful, and probably has very few supporters in the present day.

3. Minister.

The *minister* of Baptism is any man or woman, Christian or heathen, who uses the necessary matter and sufficient form, intending to do what the Church does, whether they believe in Baptism or not. The *ordinary* minister, however, is the priest alone, or in certain cases a deacon. No one else should administer Baptism except in a case of grave necessity. But all

A Priest the ordinary minister.

A layman sufficient.

persons should be taught that in such cases, as for instance where an infant (or adult properly disposed) is dying unbaptized, they can and ought to administer this Sacrament, and therefore should be instructed in the manner of administering it.

The reason that the Church permits any person to baptize in cases of grave emergency is that Baptism is universally necessary to salvation. From this it follows that schismatical, or even heretical, Baptism is valid when the proper matter and form have been used. Where there is any doubt on this point the person must be "conditionally" baptized. Where it is certain that the *proper* form and matter have *not* been used, unconditional Baptism will, of course, be necessary.

Schismatical and heretical Baptism valid.

4. Subject.

The *subject* of Baptism is any human being, whether an adult or an infant. The Church has at all times in her history encouraged the Baptism of infants at the earliest possible time. The denial of Baptism to infants began in the sixteenth century among certain sects, such as the Anabaptists, which took their rise at that time.

III. The effects of Baptism.

By Baptism a person is joined to the Church and so becomes a member of CHRIST, and therefore the child of GOD by adoption, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.

1. Regeneration.

The grace of the Sacrament of Baptism is the new birth, or gift of Regeneration; the implanting in us of the CHRIST-life; the quickening of the spiritual life.

2. Remission of sin.

Baptism remits the original sin in which we were born; as we say in the Creed, "I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins"; that is, in the case of *infants*, it remits the sin which we inherited from Adam,—not only the guilt of it but also the punishment, both temporal and eternal.

In the case of an *adult* it also remits all actual sin, provided there is penitence. It does not, however, take away the *tendency* to sin which is called in the ninth Article of Religion "concupiscence." But though this remains it can be overcome by the grace which Baptism gives us.

3. Infusion of grace.

In Baptism there is an infusion of habitual grace into the soul. In the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance this is called the "first grace," as distinguished from the "second grace" conferred by all the other Sacraments. (See page 119). There is also an infusion of the virtues of Faith, Hope, and Love, with the gifts of the HOLY GHOST.

4. Character.

Baptism imprints a certain "character," or indelible mark, upon the soul,—the character of the child of GOD. This is the result of Regeneration and is inseparable from it. As a king stamps upon the coin of his realm a mark, generally his own image, which shows that it belongs to his realm, so in Baptism a mark is put on us which is indelible and shows that we belong to the King of kings, GOD,—that we are Christians.

Those Sacraments which convey character can never be repeated, so that a person can be baptized only once. The grace however revives, so that if, for instance, an adult is baptized without right dispositions, the *character* of Baptism is given and, potentially, the distinctive grace of the Sacrament, regeneration, but the graces do not begin to work until by penitence he has removed the obstacle of sin.

Light, life, and union conferred in Baptism.

Baptism has been said to convey three great gifts: light, life, and union. That is, it illumines the soul; it quickens life, or fructifies the soul; and it incorporates us into CHRIST.

IV. Dispositions.

We must carefully distinguish between that disposition which is necessary for the *valid reception* of the Sacrament of Baptism and those which are necessary for its *beneficial effect.*

For valid Baptism consent alone is necessary.

All theologians of the Church are agreed that the only disposition required for the valid reception of Baptism is the consent of the recipient to be baptized. Neither faith nor penitence nor any other disposition is required to make the Sacrament *valid.* So that an adult who had neither faith nor penitence, but who consented to be baptized, would receive absolutely the baptismal character, and *potentially* its other peculiar gifts which, however, he would be unable to appropriate until by faith and penitence he removed the obstacles to their operation.

This follows from the fact that valid Baptism can under no circumstances be repeated. If Baptism were administered without the consent of the subject it, of course, would not be Baptism at all; as, for instance, in the case of an infidel baptized by force against his will, or of an unconscious person who had not in time of consciousness expressed some desire for Baptism. In the case of infants this consent is expressed by their sponsors, acting under the authority of the Church.

For the benefits, faith and penitence required in an adult.

For the *beneficial effects* of Baptism in an adult, that is, for the graces conveyed to be operative, right dispositions are required,—and these are faith and penitence.

No dispositions required in an infant.

These dispositions are not required in an *infant*, because (1) it is incapable of either faith or penitence, (2) it is unable to place any bar in the way of sacramental grace.

It is clear, therefore, that when the Catechism asks

the question, "What is required of persons to be baptized?" we must understand, not what is required for a *valid* Sacrament, but for a *beneficial reception* of the Sacrament; and this only in the case of an adult.

Conclusion.

It is of importance that the various aspects of the doctrine of Holy Baptism should be clearly apprehended, as on this will depend to a great degree the right understanding of the other Sacraments.

CHAPTER X.

CONFIRMATION.

Introductory.

CONFIRMATION follows Baptism in the order of the Sacraments, and is to be considered a Sacrament distinct from Baptism, conveying its own character and grace, although it is also the completion of Baptism in that it perfects what was begun in that Sacrament.

Titles of the Sacrament.

It is known by many names. From its effect in strengthening the soul it is called Confirmation; from the remote matter generally used it has the name of the Chrism, or the Sacrament of the Chrism; from its proximate matter it is known as "the laying on of hands." It is also called the Seal of the Lord, from the fact that it conveys a special character (Eph. i. 13; iv. 30). Lastly, it is called the Sacrament of Perfection, or Fulness, because it completes what was begun in Baptism. It is spoken of in the Holy Scripture as one of the four principles of the doctrine of CHRIST (Heb. vi. 1), and we have accounts of Confirmations in Acts viii. and xix.

I. Confirmation instituted by CHRIST.

Like all the Sacraments it was instituted by our Blessed Lord. For although we have no express account of its institution in the Gospels, we find the Apostles ministering the Sacrament of Confirmation immediately after Pentecost.

Some think that it was instituted during the Great Forty Days between our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension; others that it was instituted on the night of Maundy Thursday, in connection with our Lord's discourses concerning the gift of the HOLY GHOST. Others again consider that it was included in the gift of Easter Day, when our Lord breathed on the Apostles and said, "Receive ye the HOLY GHOST" (S. John xx. 22). These, however, are but theological opinions.

In regard to the matter of Confirmation there are four opinions. 1. Matter. Four Opinions.

Some theologians hold that the proximate matter is simply the laying on of hands, of which alone mention is made in Holy Scripture. This view is supported by Sirmondus, Hebert, and others. i. Imposition of hands.

Another view is that the only essential matter of Confirmation is the anointing with the chrism, which has been substituted for imposition of hands. This view is held by S. Thomas, Bellarmine, and others, and is the doctrine of the Greek Church. ii. Chrism.

Others, again, hold that the essential matter is twofold: the imposition of hands and the anointing with the chrism, separately; the imposition of hands being the "proximate" and the anointing the "remote" matter. This opinion, however, has few followers, since it is improbable that the essential and sufficient matter of this Sacrament should be twofold. iii. Twofold matter.

There yet remains a fourth view. It is that the imposition of hands, which takes place in the act of anointing (or together with the anointing) forms the proximate matter; and this view is to be preferred, as it reconciles all the others. It is the one which now prevails in the Roman Church, where the rubric directs iv. Chrismation, that is, imposition of hands together with anointing.

the Bishop, whilst he lays his hand upon the head of the confirmand, to make with his thumb the sign of the Cross with the chrism upon the forehead.

Whilst the Anglican Church differs entirely from the Eastern Church in the matter of the Sacrament, the Roman, as we have seen, combines the use of the two Churches. But as no matter was expressly ordained of CHRIST, probably no one of these uses can be said to be valid to the exclusion of the others.

2. Form.

The form consists of the words used with ecclesiastical sanction by the Bishop to signify the purpose of the laying on of hands, i. e., that it is to administer Confirmation.

i. Roman form.

Different forms are used in the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Communions. In the Roman the following is commonly considered the form: "I sign thee with the Sign of the Cross, and confirm thee with the Chrism of Salvation, in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST, Amen."

ii. Eastern form.

In the Greek Church it is: "The Seal of the Gift of the HOLY GHOST."

iii. Anglican form.

In our own Church it is: "Defend, O LORD, this Thy child with Thy heavenly grace, that he may continue Thine for ever; and daily increase in Thy HOLY SPIRIT more and more, until he come unto Thy everlasting Kingdom. Amen." As no form is expressly given in Holy Scripture, the form used is of ecclesiastical authority.

3. Minister.

A Bishop is the ordinary minister of Confirmation, although in the Greek Church priests ordinarily confirm by anointing with chrism which has been previously blessed by a Bishop. In the Roman Church it is held that a priest, by the delegation of the Supreme Pontiff, may be the minister of Confirmation, provided he uses chrism which has been blessed by a Bishop;

but he is then to be considered the extraordinary minister. The Anglican Communion confines the ministration of this Sacrament solely to the Episcopate, and, unfortunately, does not now use chrism.

The subject of Confirmation is any baptized person, since an unbaptized person is incapable of receiving any Sacrament but Baptism. In the early Church Confirmation seems to have been administered immediately after Baptism, and such is the practice at the present time in the Greek Church, where an infant is confirmed immediately after it is baptized. In the Western Church, however, for a long period Confirmation has not been administered until the child has attained to years of discretion. In the case of the Baptism of an adult, Confirmation should follow as soon afterwards as may be convenient. 4. The subject.

The disposition absolutely essential for Confirmation is "the first grace," which is given in Baptism. This grace is necessary because Confirmation, like all the Sacraments of the living, conveys only "second" grace. In those who have not lost their baptismal grace this is the only and sufficient disposition. But in those who have committed mortal sin, penitence is needed in order that the Sacrament may be beneficial to them. 5. Dispositions.

Confirmation duly received has two effects. The first is the sealing or stamping of the character of the HOLY GHOST on the soul. This character, as distinct from that of Baptism, is the military character of the soldier of CHRIST. And because it conveys character Confirmation cannot be repeated; though the *grace* revives, that is, begins to work as soon as the obstacle of sin has been removed by penitence. 6. Effects. i. Character.

Those, therefore, who have been confirmed without right dispositions receive in the Sacrament of Confirmation the character, and potentially the grace; which latter, however, is ineffectual until they repent.

ii. Special gift of the HOLY GHOST.

Secondly, Confirmation confers its own special grace, or the grace of the Sacrament, which consists in the special protection and aid of the HOLY GHOST in the fulness of His Sevenfold Gift, by which the grace of Baptism is perfected.

II. Gifts of the HOLY GHOST.

It now remains for us carefully to investigate this Sevenfold Gift, which is the special grace of Confirmation.

1. Foretold by Isaiah.

We find them mentioned in the prophecy of Isaiah, where in his description of the spiritual power of the coming Messiah he says, "And the SPIRIT of the LORD shall rest upon Him, the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Might, the Spirit of Knowledge and of the Fear of the LORD; and shall make Him of quick understanding in the Fear of the LORD" (Isaiah xi. 2, 3).

Here we must observe that though the "Fear of the LORD" is mentioned twice, the Hebrew phrase *yirath Yehovah* has evidently two meanings, "piety" and "holy fear." Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate thus translate it: the first time by *εὐσέβεια*, and *pietas*, and the second time by *φόβος Θεοῦ*, and *timor Domini*.

i. The endowment of CHRIST.

The Hebrew word Messiah and the Greek word Christ alike signify "anointed," and refer to this unction of the HOLY GHOST of which Isaiah speaks, and which took place at the first instant of our Lord's conception in the womb of His Blessed Mother. So that the Seven Gifts are in the first place the endowment of our Blessed Lord as the second

Adam, the perfect or archetypal Man, the Head of our race. In Him we see their *perfect* manifestation; but they are not confined to Him, for the anointing of our Great High Priest is shared in by every member of His Body, and these gifts are "like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down unto the beard, even unto Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his clothing" (Ps. cxxxiii. 2).

ii. Of the Church.

They are therefore found in His Church, where we can study their *corporate* operation.

iii. Of the Christian.

They are found also in each of His members, in whom is seen their *individual* manifestation. And it is to this individual operation, through the Sacrament of Confirmation, that we shall now confine our attention.

2. The virtues of man.

i. Natural or cardinal virtues.

Human nature apart from Divine grace possesses certain moral virtues. The chief of them are Temperance, Prudence, Justice, and Fortitude (Wis. viii. 7), and these four are called the Cardinal, or Natural Virtues, as distinguished from the three Theological Virtues, which are the supernatural gift of GOD. It is quite evident that these four do not depend on Sacramental grace, since we find them manifested in a very high degree of perfection among the heathen. Solon was prudent, Aristides was just, Leonidas exhibited fortitude, and Socrates was temperate.

ii. Theological virtues.

But when man is justified through being incorporated into CHRIST, three supernatural virtues are superadded, or, as we say, infused into man's nature. These three are called the Theological Virtues, because they have GOD for their object, and they directly influence the conduct of man in relation to GOD.

iii. The action of the Seven Gifts.

In order to the perfection of these infused theological virtues, the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST are bestowed upon man through his sacramental union with

CHRIST, and especially in the Sacrament of Confirmation. In the *germ* these gifts are possessed by all the baptized, and may be developed by those who are unconfirmed, but with much greater difficulty, and possibly never in their fulness.

3. Effects of One HOLY SPIRIT.

We must observe that this Sevenfold Gift in its fulness is the effect of the *One* HOLY SPIRIT Whom we receive in Confirmation. Human nature is typified (1) by the golden candlestick which GOD ordered Moses to make for the Tabernacle, with its seven branches, or lamps (Ex. xxv. 31–38); and again (2) in the vision of Zechariah, wherein he beheld "a candlestick all of gold, with a bowl upon the top of it, and his seven lamps thereon, and seven pipes to the seven lamps, which are upon the top thereof" (Zech. iv. 2).

Here we see that the candlestick is one, and that the oil is one, although it is carried to different parts of the candlestick. So by the operation of the One SPIRIT upon different faculties of the soul we have what we call the Seven Gifts of the SPIRIT. That is to say, while objectively we receive but the One Gift, the HOLY GHOST, yet by His operation that gift becomes sevenfold in its manifestation.

Four gifts intellectual, three moral.

Of these gifts of the HOLY GHOST four belong to the *intellect* and three to the *will*. The four intellectual gifts are Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, and Knowledge, and the three moral gifts are Ghostly Strength, Piety, and Holy Fear.

The Relation of the gifts to the Theological Virtues.

These gifts of the HOLY GHOST call forth and direct the supernatural virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity, which were infused into the soul at its Baptism; *faith*, which has for its province the intellect, being aided by the four intellectual gifts; *hope* being stimulated by the gift of Ghostly Strength; and *charity* being quickened by the gifts of Piety and Holy Fear.

The Seven Gifts are enumerated by the Prophet Isaiah in the order of excellence as they are seen in our Blessed Lord, Who is perfect Man. In us the order of their operation is reversed, for, as the Psalmist tells us, "the fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom" (Ps. cxi. 19). III. The Seven Gifts in their several effects.

Holy Fear must not be confounded with that servile fear of GOD which fills the sinner's heart with terror. It means rather that sense of awe or reverence when we are in GOD'S Presence, or when we are thinking of Him, which is the very foundation of all sanctity. 1. Holy Fear.

It is the great preventive of sin, for it preserves the soul in a state of great purity by giving it a supreme dread of offending GOD. It is also a great help in time of prayer. For it saves us from many distractions, produces in us a spirit of recollection, and, as the writer of Proverbs tells us, gives us a strong confidence in GOD (Prov. xiv. 26), together with a great love of Him.

The gift which our Prayer Book calls "true godliness" corresponds to the Latin word *pietas*, which we have called "Piety." The Latin word, however, has a shade of meaning which is lost in its English form, for *pietas* signifies that spirit of *filial affection* which a child has for its parents, and so indicates our duty to GOD as our Father. 2. Piety.

The gift of Piety, then, teaches us to honour GOD as our Father and to love Him with a tender affection which finds its happiness in trying to do all things to please Him; so that if others wonder at our giving so much time to His service, we may reply in the words of our Lord, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" (S. Luke ii. 49).

The spirit of Piety, again, saves us from despair when we fall into sin, for it enables us to come to GOD as to

our Father, with the humble confidence of a child asking pardon.

Piety also enables us to accept the sorrows and pains of life as permitted by a Father Who sends them to us in love, and to Whose will it is our greatest joy to submit.

Moreover it will lead us to seek numberless ways of expressing our love for GOD in acts of worship, and will save our religious life from that coldness which is the special characteristic of Protestantism.

3. Ghostly Strength (Might).

The gift of Ghostly Strength, or Might, not only supplies the soul with strength to carry out that which it knows to be its duty, but also gives a spirit of fortitude or supernatural energy which enables us to overcome our own weakness and to triumph over the difficulties, dangers, and trials with which we have to meet. By this gift we are able to say with S. Paul, "I can do all things through CHRIST Which strengtheneth me" (Phil. iv. 13).

We pass now from the moral gifts, the gifts which aid the will, to those which perfect the intellect. The intellect works in two ways: *speculatively* in the realm of thought, *practically* in that of action.

A man may have a brilliant speculative intellect, and so be a deep thinker, yet he may be wanting in that practical gift which we call "common sense," and which directs the ordinary actions of life. On the other hand, a man may have a good practical intellect, which may show itself in ordinary life, and yet may be wanting in that higher mental power, the speculative gift, which would make him a distinguished thinker.

Of the four intellectual gifts of the SPIRIT, Wisdom and Understanding perfect the speculative intellect, Counsel and Knowledge the practical intellect.

Of the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST Knowledge is in some respects the most difficult to define. Even theologians differ in regard to it, since it is so closely allied to the other intellectual gifts of Wisdom, Understanding, and Counsel, and to the supreme virtue of faith. Following, however, the doctrine of S. Augustine as set forth by Suarez, we shall confine this gift to the knowledge of *creatures*. 4. Knowledge.

This knowledge is not less necessary to our salvation than the knowledge of GOD. For by it the HOLY SPIRIT shows us all creatures in their true light, divesting riches, honours, and pleasures of their unreal glitter, and showing us how fragile they are, how transient, how incapable of making us happy, and how dangerous to our salvation. Satan uses the creatures as the instruments of nearly all his temptations, but always by deceiving us about them, as he did Eve about the forbidden fruit. The gift of Knowledge enables us to know good and evil, that is, to distinguish between them. i. Of creatures.

This gift also teaches us to use all creatures as steps of the ladder by which we mount up to GOD, Who created them for us. Thus they fulfil their true purpose in leading us to glorify Him. It is this gift which enables us to use the "Benedicite" aright, and like the Three Holy Children so to use the instruments of temptation as to turn them to the glory of GOD and to redeem them from their bondage to Satan. The spirit of Knowledge teaches us to sing with them, in the furnace of this world, "O ye fire and heat, bless ye the LORD; praise Him, and magnify Him for ever." ii. Of their true end.

Moreover, this gift of Knowledge instructs us in the mode of conversing and dealing with our neighbour as iii. Guides us in our life

and work.

regards the supernatural end of our creation. By it a preacher knows what he ought to say to his hearers; by it, too, a director knows the condition and spiritual needs of the souls which he has under his guidance. Lastly, the gift of Knowledge enables us to know GOD by means of creatures, and so to rise from the knowledge of second causes to the First Universal Cause.

5. Counsel.

The spirit of Counsel is given to the soul to direct it in its action, and is in the supernatural order what prudence is in the natural order. It shows us what we must do or not do, what we must say or not say, according to persons, times, and seasons. What wisdom and science teach us generally the gift of Counsel applies to particular cases. It enables us to choose the means which are best fitted to carry out our ends. It is the gift which is needed especially by those who have to guide others, as directors of souls, and parents who have to guide their children. This gift should be specially stirred up by prayer before deciding upon any course of action in regard to which we are in doubt.

6. Understanding gives a knowledge of GOD'S
i. Perfections.
ii. Ways.
iii. Word.
iv. Religion.
v. Providence.

The gift of Understanding enables the soul better to know GOD in His ineffable *perfections;* in the riches of His love as manifested in His *mysterious dealing* with the soul; in His *Word* contained in Holy Scripture; in the *Religion* which He has revealed to us; and in the *Providence* which presides over our lives.

The ideas of reason in regard to these truths about GOD are limited; even the ideas engendered by faith are often dark, or at the best but like the twilight. It is the gift of Understanding which is the broad daylight of the soul, by the aid of which we see into the depths of all things with intelligence, so that our *intelligere* is really the *intus legere*. Understanding may be considered as the analytical gift by which, when we

meditate on any revealed truth, we are enabled to see it in its parts and in its right relation to other truths.

7. Wisdom.

The derivation of the word "wisdom" both in Latin and in Greek enables us to distinguish its exact meaning. Its root is found in the Latin verb *sapere*, which means "to taste," and it is defined by S. Bernard as a disgust for the things of this world and a taste for the things of GOD.

i. Gives sweetness.

The gift of Wisdom is such a knowledge of GOD, of His attributes and mysteries, as is full of sweetness. Understanding only conceives and penetrates; Wisdom judges and compares. Wisdom enables us to see causes, reasons, fitnesses. It represents to us GOD, His greatness, His beauty, His perfections, His mysteries, as infinitely adorable and worthy of love; and from this knowledge there results a delicious taste. Thus it is that to this gift belong spiritual sweetnesses, consolations, and sensible graces. They are effects of the gift of Wisdom. "O how sweet are Thy words unto my throat, yea, sweeter than honey unto my mouth!" (Ps. cxix. 103).

ii. Intuition.

This gift of spiritual taste enables its possessor without process of reasoning to recognize what is true and right by *intuition*, just as the gift of natural taste enables us to detect at once the nature of the food in our mouth. It enables him to refer all things to their true end in eternity, and so to have a taste for those things which are repugnant to the worldly heart. It causes him to find great attraction in prayer, meditation, and other exercises of piety. It enables him to count austerities, poverty, and humiliation as privileges. This is the highest of all gifts, and is the specific remedy for the disorder left within us by the Fall. Original sin

gives us a tendency to evil, whereas Wisdom makes us delight in that which is good.

All Seven Gifts potentially received.

In Confirmation the Christian receives all the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST. All are present potentially, and all ought to be more or less exercised. But each individual, partly from his temperament, which is GOD'S gift, and partly from his circumstances, will generally develop some one of the gifts more fully than the others.

IV. Their special operations produce classes in the Church.

This can be illustrated best by enumerating the results of their operation in the Church as observed in the production of certain classes of workers for the edification of the Body of CHRIST.

1. Holy Fear, the Saints.

The gift of Holy Fear, which is the foundation of all spiritual life, may be said to have produced the Saints generally. In the reverence and love for GOD which they all manifested we may see the common characteristic and essential foundation of their sanctity.

2. Piety, the builders of Churches, etc.

The gift of Piety has produced perhaps a greater variety of material fruits than any other gift, for to it we may trace the glorious architecture of our Churches, their liturgies, their hymnology, and the sacred music used in Divine Service. The filial love of the Catholic Christian has ever striven to express itself by making the Church and its Services as beautiful as possible in all their details. Because the Church is GOD'S House we adorn it with windows of magnificent glass; the holy vestments and vessels are rich with embroidery and studded with jewels, all telling of our loving worship of GOD, and that we feel nothing can be too costly for His service.

The plainness and squalor of the meeting-houses of sectarians—such a contrast to the glories of the Church—are what we should expect from those who have no

Sacrament of Confirmation. The same is true in the case of some of our own Churches where the Sacramental character of Confirmation is either unrecognized or expressly denied.

3. Ghostly Strength, the martyrs.

Ghostly Strength in its highest manifestation has produced that "noble army of Martyrs" which is the Church's greatest glory.

4. Knowledge, the apologists.

Knowledge in its special development may be said to have produced those apologetic theologians of the Church who have met the "oppositions of science falsely so called" (1 S. Tim. vi. 20) with that true science which is the gift of the HOLY GHOST.

5. Counsel, the moral theologians.

The gift of Counsel has produced the moral theologians of the Church, whose writings guide individual priests in their dealings with souls, and so form the rule of conduct of the Christian Church.

6. Understanding, the dogmatic theologians.

The gift of Understanding in its most perfect operation has given to the Church her dogmatic theologians, who have taught us the full meaning of her Creeds.

7. Wisdom, the ascetic theologians.

Lastly, the gift of Wisdom has produced those ascetic theologians whose spiritual writings have strengthened and encouraged and guided the children of CHRIST in the practical details of their spiritual life, and enabled them to "taste and see how gracious the LORD is" (Ps. xxxiv. 8).

V. The gifts develop a Christian life.

These gifts, of course, are special operations of the HOLY GHOST in different souls. The *general* effect of the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST is to form in us the features of the Perfect Man, our Lord JESUS CHRIST. As we have noticed, Isaiah speaks of these gifts as the endowment of the Messiah, and their exercise should be manifested in the production of a Christlike life as revealed by our Lord Himself in the Seven Beatitudes.

As revealed in the Beatitudes.

Without discussing them we may point out the Beatitude which corresponds to each gift. The gift of Holy Fear produces the poor in spirit; the gift of Piety, the meek; the gift of Knowledge, those that mourn; Ghostly Strength, those which hunger and thirst after righteousness; Counsel, the merciful; Understanding, the pure in heart; and Wisdom, the peacemakers.

And are the remedy for the Deadly Sins.

Again, we may notice that not only does each of the gifts produce a characteristic of Christlike life, but it enables us to overcome some special sin, so that we may also see the effect of the Seven Gifts of the SPIRIT in the conquest of the seven Deadly Sins. Holy Fear will enable us to overcome pride; Piety, envy; Ghostly Strength, sloth; Knowledge, anger; Counsel, covetousness; Understanding, gluttony; and Wisdom, lust.

They produce the Fruits of the SPIRIT.

Besides this, S. Paul tells us that there are nine *Fruits* of the SPIRIT, which we may consider as the result of the possession and use of the Seven Gifts.

1. In our life towards GOD.

2. Towards our neighbour.

3. Towards ourselves.

These fruits of the SPIRIT fall into three classes: those which we exercise towards GOD—Love, Joy, and Peace; those which we manifest towards our *neighbour*—Long-suffering, Kindness, and Goodness; and those which form in *ourselves* the special virtues of Fidelity, Meekness, and Temperance.

The weapons of the Christian.

Confirmation, in a word, is the putting into the hands of the young Christian soldier the weapons of his warfare, by which he may be "more than conqueror." How foolish the soldier would be who went into battle without armour or weapons, thinking on this account that he was less likely to be killed,—instead of realizing his helpless and unprotected condition! So it is with those who will not be confirmed. They go out into the thick of the fight without shield to ward off the darts of the wicked one, and without sword to drive him back.

The ceremony of knighthood.

The preparation for Confirmation may remind us of a beautiful ceremony observed in the old days of chivalry when the young soldier who had been trained in martial exercises and had proved his valour was to receive the gift of knighthood. The evening before this honour was conferred, his weapons and armour were placed in the Church where he watched and prayed all night, asking GOD'S grace that he might be a true and loyal knight, and that he might ever draw his sword only on the side of right, in defence of the weak and helpless. After a night spent thus in preparation, he received the "accolade" which admitted him to the full privilege of knighthood.

Conclusion.

So in preparation for Confirmation we "watch and pray," and learn the power of those gifts which Confirmation confers, and resolve that we will use them faithfully in our struggle with evil, in the true service of CHRIST.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

Introductory.

A Sacrament needed for post-baptismal sin.

WE have seen that in Baptism, when it is duly received, all sin and its penalties are remitted. For those who have never afterwards been guilty of mortal sin this Sacrament would be sufficient. But with most of us, and especially with those who were baptized as infants, post-baptismal sin is both frequent and often most serious.

Mortal sin destroys grace.

Grievous, or mortal sin cuts the soul off from GOD, destroys all grace, and renders the soul displeasing to GOD; and no works done in this state can be acceptable to Him. Since this is so, it is evident that the great majority of Christians would be lost through their forfeiture of baptismal grace if no remedy were provided. For the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is efficacious only in souls that are free from mortal sin, and therefore no benefit can be obtained from it by those who have lost the first grace. On this account our Blessed Lord, of His infinite love, has instituted in His Church the Sacrament of Penance as the means whereby all sin committed after Baptism may be remitted to those who are penitent.

Institution of this Sacrament.

Penance as a virtue.

Penitence, repentance, or penance (for the three words indicate one and the same thing) is the translation of the Greek word *μετάνοια*, which signifies a change of

mind and heart and life, manifested by some external act. Penance is both a virtue and a Sacrament.

As a virtue it has existed since the time of Adam, for from the beginning of the world the virtue of penitence has worked among men. It is an interior disposition of the soul towards GOD, and from the beginning of the world the HOLY GHOST, Whose office it is to "convince the world of sin" (S. John xvi. 8), has convinced sinners of their transgressions, converted them to penitence, and through penitence has made them Saints.

As a Sacrament.

But while this virtue of penitence works also in the Christian Church, our Blessed Lord has added to it a Sacrament. He has taken the penitence which was working in the world before His Advent, and for us Christians has incorporated it in a visible sign by which He communicates forgiveness of sins, and the grace of penitence to those who seek it rightly.

This He did on that most solemn occasion when He first appeared to His assembled Apostles after His Resurrection. So desirous was He to impart to His Church this great gift by which man might be loosed from sin, that immediately after He had won the power of Absolution for the Church by His Death and Resurrection He bestowed it upon her. He had promised the gift before His Passion, when He said, "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (S. Matt. xviii. 18). Then, having made satisfaction for the sin of all the world, He imparted the power of Absolution to His Apostles when He breathed on them, and said unto them, "Receive ye the HOLY GHOST: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (S. John xx. 22, 23).

A safeguard against self-deceit regarding one's spiritual state.

Thus we see that on the first Easter night CHRIST instituted the Sacrament of Penance, in order that men might have something more than their self-assurance on which to depend for the hope of Absolution. The Pharisee in the Temple said, "GOD, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are," that is, he absolved himself. But that absolution was not ratified in Heaven. So it is with many now; they absolve themselves, they forget their sins and constantly deceive themselves with the idea that GOD also forgets them. No state can be more delusive or more fatal; and it is to guard us against this danger that our Lord instituted a Sacrament in which to assure us by a judicial act that we are absolved in the name and by the power of JESUS CHRIST, by one who is His authorized representative.

I. Sacrament of Penance.

All Sacraments have, as we have seen, what is called matter and form. There has been considerable difference of opinion among theologians regarding the

1. The matter.

matter of this Sacrament. (1) The earliest view was that an imposition of hands by the priest as a sign of Absolution constitutes the matter. (2) Some, again, think that the sins forgiven are the matter; and (3) others that it is the disposition of heart with which the penitent receives Absolution. The great majority hold the last view, for the sins which are remitted are not the matter of the Sacrament, but the matter on which the grace of the Sacrament acts.

1. Proximate matter.

Following the more usual view, we shall say that the *proximate* matter of the Sacrament is the contrition, confession, and satisfaction which constitute the act of penitence at the time of Absolution.

The sins which are remitted are spoken of as the

remote matter, and are divided into two classes, necessary and voluntary matter. ii. Remote matter.

Necessary matter is all mortal sin committed since Baptism (or since the last good confession) which must be confessed if the Sacrament is to be of any avail. (1) Necessary.

Voluntary matter is our venial sins, which, though not of absolute obligation, it is safer for us to confess. For venial sins easily pass into mortal sins, and indeed we may sometimes make a mistake and think those sins venial which are mortal. Moreover, it deepens our penitence and increases the virtue of humility to accuse ourselves of every sin that we remember having committed. (2) Voluntary.

If in our confession we were wilfully to omit one mortal sin the confession would be sacrilegious and the Absolution void; but this is not the case if we omit venial sin.

The form in the Sacrament of Penance consists of the words of the priest by which the sin is absolved. These words have varied at different times, and as they were not ordained by our Lord Himself it is not essential to the Sacrament that any particular form should be used, so long as that used indicates remission of sin. 2. The form.

Morinus shows that during the first twelve centuries of the Christian Era the form was precatory.

In the English Church the form is found in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, and is as follows: "Our Lord JESUS CHRIST, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by His authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. Amen."

In the Roman Church the essential form is, "I absolve thee from thy sins." In the Russian Church the form is, "May our Lord and God Jesus Christ, by the grace and bounty of His mercy, pardon you all your sins, my child; and I, His unworthy priest, by the power which He has given me, pardon and absolve you from all your sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." A precatory form is used in the other Communions of the East.

3. Minister. The minister of Absolution is a priest or Bishop having jurisdiction, although in cases of emergency, such as danger of death, any priest, even though he be schismatical or deposed, may absolve.

We must carefully bear in mind that while the priest is the minister of the Sacrament on earth, there is but one Absolver, Jesus Christ Himself, and the power of forgiveness does not belong to the priest as a man, but to the Priesthood of Jesus Christ, Whose representative he is. In the Sacrament of Penance the priest acts as judge, the Absolution being a judicial sentence.

In Penance, as in other Sacraments, the matter and form, that is, the confession and Absolution, must be so united as to form really one act; so that it is not lawful either to make Sacramental confession or to send Absolution by letter. This does not mean that the substance of the confession may not be put in writing and sent to one's director, but that in the Sacrament itself the accusation must be made by word of mouth, and with a view to Absolution.

4. The subject. The subject of the Sacrament is any person who has received valid Baptism.

5. Dispositions. The penitent must approach the Sacrament with right dispositions. They are ordinarily expressed in

the three conditions of the Sacrament,—Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction.

Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction.

As these will be treated in the next chapter, we shall pass over them now, merely observing that attrition, or the sorrow for sin which arises rather from fear than from love of GOD, is considered sufficient when joined to the use of the Sacrament. For there is in the Sacrament a grace of the HOLY GHOST which has the twofold effect: (1) of giving us light to know ourselves more truly, and (2) of enabling us to realize the number and gravity of our sins and to be contrite,—thus raising our imperfect attrition to the plane of contrition.

Attrition.

This Sacrament, like Baptism, is a Sacrament of the dead, and conveys what is called "the first grace." All the other Sacraments are Sacraments of the living, that is they are effectual only where there is already grace in the soul. But Baptism and Penance raise persons from a state of sin or spiritual death to a state of grace or spiritual life. They are said, therefore, to convey the first grace; while all the other Sacraments convey "the second grace," which is really an increase of habitual grace.

6. Effects.

It conveys "first grace."

The "grace of the Sacrament" is the loosing or absolving of the soul from the bonds of sin, or, as we say, the remission of sin.

Grace of the Sacrament.

Penance infuses sanctifying grace, that is charity, or the love of GOD, into the soul. When a man is in mortal sin he has no love of GOD in his soul, for mortal sin has destroyed it, and the soul is therefore in a state of spiritual death. When he comes to his confession he has nothing left in his soul but faith and hope,—faith in the power of the Precious Blood to wash away sins, and hope that he himself may be forgiven.

Sanctifying grace or charity.

Restoration of merits.

Definition of merits.

Penance restores the soul to its previous condition of grace. By this we mean that there is a restoration of merits to the person absolved. All the good works of our life, prayers, Communions, almsdeeds, sufferings patiently borne, etc., so far as they are the results of the grace of CHRIST in our soul, are meritorious. Our Lord said, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven" (S. Matt. vi. 20). These treasures are our merits; not that we can merit anything *of ourselves*, but that merit is the link constituted by the promise of GOD, of His free and sovereign grace, between our actions and their reward.

In mortal sin we cannot merit.

While we are in a state of mortal sin we cannot merit. Sometimes persons with great sin on their consciences inflict punishment on themselves, or give alms, or do works of mercy, in order, if possible, to satisfy the voice of conscience within them. But these works are of no avail to merit grace or forgiveness, because they are not done in the grace of CHRIST. All works done whilst mortal sin is unremitted are "dead works," and the grace of Absolution cannot *revive* the works which have never had life.

Dead works.

That which the grace of Absolution restores is the merits of our life, those good works only which were done when we were in grace.

Infused virtues revived.

Besides this it revives the virtues which were infused into us by Baptism and Confirmation, and the gifts of the HOLY GHOST which we received in the latter Sacrament. For, as we have already observed, the graces of those three Sacraments which cannot be repeated,—Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders—if forfeited by mortal sin, revive when the soul is restored to a state of grace through the Sacrament of Penance.

Before we pass from the effects of the Sacrament we must observe that every mortal sin involves two things, guilt and punishment. The first is entirely removed by Absolution, as is also *eternal* punishment, but the penance, or temporal punishment, which is due to sin, is not remitted by Absolution. This, however, will be treated more fully when we speak of satisfaction.

Mortal sin involves guilt and punishment.

In our Prayer-Book we find three forms of Absolution:

II. Forms of Absolution.

The first, which is found in Matins and Evensong, is declaratory. This is simply (1) a declaration that the power of Absolution has been committed to GOD'S ministers; and (2) that the Absolution depends for its efficacy on the penitence of those who seek it; followed by (3) an exhortation to all so to repent that they may be entitled to this grace.

1. Declaratory at Matins and Evensong.

Here we have not one word which asserts that any one's sins are absolved, and it would be absurd, if they were absolved, to finish the prayer, as we do, with the words, "Wherefore let us beseech Him to grant us true repentance"; for it would be a stultifying of the Absolution which we thought we had just received. We may illustrate this from the Baptismal Office. After the act of Baptism the priest is directed to say, "Seeing now that this child *is regenerate*," etc. It would be very strange if he were told to go on praying that it might be regenerate.

The second form of Absolution, which is found in the Liturgy, is precatory. Here we have a prayer that GOD, Who has promised forgiveness of sins to all who are penitent, will forgive all our sins and confirm us in all goodness.

2. Precatory in the Liturgy.

Now this Absolution refers only to those, as the rubric distinctly says, "who are minded to receive the Holy

Rubric preceding it.

Communion," and who therefore are in a state of grace, that is, free from mortal sin. For to those who are in mortal sin a warning has been given in the longer exhortation in these words: "Repent you of your sins, or else come not to that holy Table. And because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion, but with a full trust in GOD'S mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore, if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel; let him come to me, or to some other Minister of GOD'S Word, and open his grief." It is evident, therefore, that those to whom this Absolution is addressed must have a quiet conscience, that is, must be free from mortal sin.

The long exhortation.

Pardon of venial sin.

But while mortal sin cuts us off from GOD altogether, so that if we receive the Holy Communion in that state we eat and drink damnation to ourselves, yet there is another class of sin from which none of us are free, and which we theologically call "venial" or pardonable sin, because GOD forgives such sins in response to prayer. S. John tells us: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and He shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it. All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death" (1 S. John v. 16, 17).

This precatory Absolution in the Liturgy, therefore, is exactly in accordance with S. John's teaching concerning prayer for those who have sinned "not unto death," and it undoubtedly avails for the remission of such venial sin. When our Lord was washing His Apostles' feet, He said to S. Peter: "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean

every whit" (S. John xiii. 10). "He that is washed" (ὁ λελουμένος) signifies the Christian who still retains his baptismal grace, but who needs to wash away the dust of venial sin which, as it were, settles upon us every day of our pilgrimage in this world.

3. Judicial in the Sacrament of Penance.

The third form of Absolution is found in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, and is judicial; that is to say, the priest sitting as CHRIST'S representative judges of the sins confessed and pronounces the sentence of acquittal; and as this is a Sacrament it conveys the grace of Absolution.

Precatory form sufficient.

The difference is not in the form of words. Probably the form in the Communion Service would be sufficient, as until the twelfth century the precatory form was used both in the East and West, and in the East its use continued to be universal until quite recently. The difference is that one form is an integral part of a Sacrament and the other is not. For it is of the essence of a Sacrament that it should be ministered to an individual. And one might as well assert that a clergyman by reading the Baptismal Service baptizes all in the congregation who happen to be unbaptized, as think that by saying a form of Absolution over them he absolves all those who are in *mortal* sin.

A Sacrament can only be ministered to a subject.

Teaching of the exhortation.

If this were the teaching of the Church of England, the longer exhortation,—after having directed persons to "examine" themselves "by the rule of GOD'S Commandments," and to confess to Almighty GOD "with full purpose of amendment of life," and to make restitution where they have wronged their neighbours,—would go on to instruct them to go to Church and get absolved when the Absolution was pronounced in the Communion Service. But it does nothing of the

kind. It tells them if their consciences are not quiet to go and make their confession to a priest; if their consciences are quiet, it of course implies that they are already forgiven.

There can be very little real doubt respecting the intention of those who drew up the longer exhortation. It was to tell those who did not believe in Sacramental confession and Absolution to manage their own penitence the best way they could; but if they found that this was not a success, to go and make their confession.

Confession not compulsory.

The Church of England undoubtedly does not compel her children to use Sacramental confession. She leaves them free to make their peace with GOD in their own way, only warning them that it is requisite that they should come to Communion "with a quiet conscience," that is to say, that before Communion their peace with GOD should have been made. But nowhere does she imply anything so absurd as that a public prayer said over those "who are minded to receive the Holy Communion," can give them Sacramental Absolution from mortal sin.

The equivalent of the Sacrament.

Theologians have always held that an act of *perfect* contrition is itself sufficient for the remission of all post-baptismal sin, but that this act of contrition could not be perfect unless it included the intention to use the means of grace appointed by CHRIST, when the opportunity offered. We may therefore entertain the hope that for those who are in ignorance regarding the Sacrament of Penance, or from invincible prejudice disbelieve in it, an act of contrition may be sufficient for the remission of their sins without any Absolution. This, however, cannot avail for those who believe in the power of Absolution.

III. History of Absolutions in the Liturgy.

To those who accept the position that a doctrine, to be Catholic (and therefore binding on us) needs only to have the three characteristics of universality, antiquity, and consent,—there can be no question about the matter, for there was no *public* Absolution in any Eucharistic Service of the Church until the sixteenth century.

There was in the Breviary Offices from the time of S. Basil a prayer for pardon, but these Offices were monastic, and there was no idea that this prayer conveyed any remission of mortal sin.

In the Service of the Holy Eucharist in the Western Church, the first proof of any such Absolution dates from the Third Council of Ravenna, A.D. 1314. It was then ordered that throughout the *Province* of Ravenna the Confiteor should be said in a form very similar to that used in the Roman Church at the present time; and since the publication of the Missal of Pius V., who died A.D. 1572, this has been the use of the Roman Church.

We must observe, however, that the confession and Absolution as said at first in the Church of Ravenna were said only by the priest and server before the Mass began, and not by the people. Even now the confession and Absolution of the people have no place in the Missal or Liturgy, being found only in the *Rituale* with directions that they are to be used when Communion is given to the people either *extra* or *intra Missam*. That is to say, they have no connection with the Liturgy, and are not considered to have any Sacramental efficacy for the remission of mortal sin. They are used only just before the Communion of the people, whether it be, as we have said, at the time of Mass, or, as is the case in many coun-

tries, entirely distinct from the Service of the Holy Eucharist.

The theory, therefore, that people can be sacramentally absolved apart from the Sacrament of Penance has neither universality, antiquity nor consent to recommend it. Such a theory was apparently quite unknown until the sixteenth century, and is still alike foreign to both the Roman and Greek Communions. Either our reformers invented a new Sacrament, or our Absolution in the Communion Office is merely a prayer for the remission of *venial* sin.

Conclusion.

It is not too much to say that as we know of no *revealed* way by which the original sin in which we are born can be remitted except by Baptism, so we know of no *revealed* way by which the mortal sin which we have committed since Baptism can be remitted, save by Absolution.

God, however, is not tied down to means, and for those who sincerely repent, and through no fault of their own (from ignorance or prejudice) are unable to seek Absolution, we may hope and believe that their penitence is accepted with God.

CHAPTER XII.

SIN AND SELF-EXAMINATION.

Introductory.

The question of salvation.

THE question of all questions for each individual soul is, whether at the moment of death, at the moment when probation ceases, that soul is in a state of grace or in a state of sin; for on this depends its salvation or its eternal loss. We have seen that the Sacrament of Penance is the ordinary means by which mortal sin committed after Baptism is remitted; and that to obtain the benefit of this Sacrament, that is the remission of sin, we must approach it with right dispositions, namely Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction.

Necessity of self-examination and of some instruction on sin.

But in order that we may be contrite and make a good confession it is necessary that we should know what our sins are, that we should have some realization of their number and gravity. To obtain this knowledge, self-examination is absolutely necessary. And to make a good self-examination we must clearly understand something of the nature and characteristics of sin.

I. Sin: its nature and malice.

Sin may be defined in many ways. The word itself means "the missing of a mark," and signifies not so much the nature as it does the result of sin, which is failure on the part of man to attain his true end.

Definition.

S. John in his definition of it says, "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 S. John iii. 4). GOD'S

perfections are the law of His own Nature, and GOD has written upon the conscience of man, even in the state of nature, an outline of these perfections, for He has made man to know that there is a difference between right and wrong. But the moral law of GOD is His revelation of Himself to man, and this law is written not only upon man's conscience but in the Holy Scriptures, and in the law, and in the precepts of the Church. When a man breaks this law in thought, word, or deed, he commits sin.

Sin is also defined to be "any thought, word, or deed which is contrary to the will of GOD"; for GOD'S will is the perfection of Himself,—holy, just, pure, merciful, true. The conformity of man to the will of GOD is the perfection of the human soul. The malice of sin consists in the conscious rebellion of a created will against the uncreated will of GOD.

When GOD made man in His own image and after His own likeness, He bestowed upon him all that he could receive. He could not give His own Nature to man, since that Nature is an uncreated one; but He did bestow what man was able to receive,—an intelligence, a soul, a heart, a conscience, so that he might be an intelligent and moral being. The malice of sin consists in an intelligent creature, having the power of free will, deliberately and consciously opposing the will of its Creator.

Malice of sin against GOD the FATHER,

The essential malice of sin is in the will of man, and is threefold. (1) It is against GOD the FATHER, Who made man in His image and after His likeness that he might be the object of His love and might know Him, love Him, serve Him, and worship Him. (2) It is against GOD the SON, Who redeemed mankind. For sinners, S. Paul says, are "the enemies of the Cross

the SON,

of CHRIST" (Phil. iii. 18) and tread "under foot the Son of GOD" (Heb. x. 29). (3) And it is against the HOLY GHOST. For to sin is to do "despite unto the SPIRIT of grace" (Heb. x. 29), and S. Paul exhorts us that we "quench not the SPIRIT" (1 Thess. v. 19); while our Lord Himself warns us that "all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the HOLY GHOST shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the HOLY GHOST, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (S. Matt. xii. 31, 32). This sin against the HOLY GHOST is not, as some have supposed, a definite sin of act, so much as a refusal (or inability caused by previous sin) to repent, which is the rejection of the whole dispensation of grace. In all sin we grieve the HOLY GHOST, and if we persevere in sin we may quench the fire of the HOLY SPIRIT within us.

and the HOLY GHOST.

We have already, in the chapter on Baptism, treated of original sin. We will now consider the nature and effect of actual sin, that is of sin actually committed since Baptism.

II. Divisions of sin.

1. Actual and habitual.

Actual sin is the conscious disobedience of man to the known will of GOD. It involves both the intellect and the will, that is, there is the *knowledge* of what is being done, and the *intention* to do it, although its malice lies especially in the will, by which man chooses evil instead of good. Actual sin is something said, done, or desired contrary to the eternal law of GOD.

i. Actual sin.

Habitual sin is the permanent *state* that results from acts of actual sin when they are so serious as to be mortal. That is, the soul is deprived of grace, and has

ii. Habitual sin.

upon it the stain of guilt; it is therefore alienated from GOD, and under the sentence of His justice. The state of habitual sin is changed to a state of grace by the operation of the Precious Blood of our Lord ministered ordinarily through the Sacrament of Penance.

2. Formal and material.

Actual sin is usually divided by theologians into *formal* and *material* sin.

i. Formal sin.

Formal sin is sin committed with the clear knowledge of what we are doing and with a full determination to do it, that is with consciousness of guilt and consent of the will. So that in proportion as men have light to know GOD'S law the sinfulness of their disobedience is increased. We are guilty in the measure in which we have light. Those who, like the heathen, know only the natural law, and break that law, are guilty. Those who are Christians, and, having the light of the Christian religion, sin against its precepts, are more guilty. And those who have the full light of the Catholic Faith, if they break the laws of GOD and of His Church, are guiltiest of all.

ii. Material sin.

Material sins, on the other hand, are the same actions done without the intention of doing them; or without sufficient knowledge. Two men may do the same act, and yet only one may be guilty of formal sin. Thus, a man may be driving on a dark night and run over a person and kill him, and yet not be guilty of murder, because, though he knew that to kill a person is murder, he had no intention of doing so. On the other hand, an uneducated Churchman may make his Communion after breaking his fast, and though this is grievous sin because it is absolutely opposed to the law of the Church, yet, if he had no knowledge of that law, and therefore no consciousness of guilt, it was in his case only "material" and not formal sin.

Hence material sin is an act of sin considered *per se*. Formal sin is the same act regarded in its relation to the *sinner*.

Formal sin may be divided into *mortal* and *venial*, and into sins of *omission* and *commission*. **3. Mortal and venial.**

From the Holy Scripture and from the teachings of the Church it is quite clear that there are some sins "unto death" and some "not unto death" (1 S. John v. 16, 17), just as there are some diseases of the body which cause death, and others which, while they cause weakness and pain, are not mortal.

A mortal sin is one so great that it kills all grace in the soul and separates it from GOD. While we are in mortal sin, we cannot, as we have already seen, acquire merit, or please GOD; but we are in a state of guilt, and under the sentence of His justice. Mortal sin is so terrible in its malice and in its consequences that a Christian ought to be willing to die rather than to commit it; and while it is of faith that unless sanctified by a special grace, as in the case of our Lady, even the greatest Saint sins (that is, commits venial sins through the infirmity of human nature), yet the Christian who is using the means of grace and earnestly desires to please GOD, ought never to fall into mortal sin. **i. Mortal sin.**

Since mortal sin is so hateful to GOD and so disastrous to man it is important that we should be able to recognize it in ourselves when we make our self-examination, if we have been so unfortunate as ever in our lives to fall into it. For it is *necessary* matter for confession in the Sacrament of Penance, and must be acknowledged with contrition if it is to be forgiven.

The characteristics of mortal sin are three: There must be "weighty matter" (Office for the Visitation of the Sick). Most Protestant sects refuse to recog- **Its characteristics: (1) Weighty matter.**

nize any difference in sin, and represent all sins as equal. They therefore ought to hold that the trifling anger of a little child is as great an act of sin as the violence of a man who commits murder, since both are breaches of the Sixth Commandment; or that the child who takes a lump of sugar is as guilty as the burglar who robs a bank. Not only does the moral sense of man refuse to admit this, but S. John tells us plainly that, while "all unrighteousness is sin," "there is a sin not unto death, as well as "a sin unto death"; so that, considered *per se*, the difference between mortal and venial sin is to be found in the gravity of the act itself.

(2) Consciousness of guilt.

For a sin to be mortal it must not only have weighty matter, but there must be a conciousness of guilt. The man at the time he committed the sin must have been conscious that he was doing wrong. No sin committed in ignorance can be mortal.

(3) Consent of the will.

To make a sin mortal there must also be a full consent of the will, so that an act, however grievous, if done unintentionally cannot be mortal. For instance, when a man is out shooting and accidentally shoots his friend, though the matter is weighty the sin is not a mortal one.

Hence we see that for a sin to be *mortal* it must have the characteristics of "formal" sin together with the fact that it is in itself seriously wrong. It seems incomprehensible that any Christian who really loves GOD can commit mortal sin, and yet unfortunately this is often the case.

ii. Venial sin.

Venial sin must not be looked upon merely as "little sins," since no sins are really little in the sight of GOD. The word venial means "pardonable," and is applied to such sins as do not possess the characteristics of mortal sin and to such as may be found in souls that

are united with GOD, in a state of grace, loving GOD and desiring to obey Him.

Nor are venial sins merely temptations to sin, as some people perhaps think; for temptations to sin are not sins at all. On the contrary, if temptations are resisted they enable us to acquire merit and many other good things.

Venial sins are rather those sins of infirmity or surprise into which every man at times is apt to fall. Probably all the seven Deadly Sins can be committed through infirmity or surprise, and therefore without deliberation, in such a way that they are not mortal; and this will explain the words of Holy Scripture, "A just man falleth seven times" (Prov. xxiv. 16).

All those who have preserved their baptismal grace are in a state of union with GOD, and all have preserved it who have not fallen into mortal sin. Yet there is probably no one who does not almost every day commit venial sins through temper or pride or slothfulness. Such sins, however, do not destroy baptismal grace, and it seems to be of these that our Lord spoke when He said to S. Peter, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit" (S. John xiii. 10).

Venial sin remitted through prayer.

These venial sins do not need the grace of Absolution, but can be remitted through prayer and acts of contrition. As S. John says: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and He shall give him life for them that sin not unto death" (1 S. John v. 16).

Evils of venial sin.

It would be, however, a very great mistake for any one to think lightly of venial sin, since many evils follow in its train.

(1) Diminution of fervour.

It is true that theologians deny that venial sins diminish grace; for the grace of GOD is like life, in that life cannot be diminished, as there is no state between life and death. Yet as the vitality of a living man may be decreased and his powers diminished by diseases which are not in themselves fatal; so in like manner venial sins in effect do undoubtedly *though indirectly* diminish grace, for they hinder the fervour of the soul. And fervour S. Bernard tells us has among many other effects especially two—first, it renders easy to us what we have to do, and second, we find delight in our duty in that fervour enables us to fulfil it easily. Thus the habit of venial sin renders it often difficult to fulfil our obligations—for instance, to pray well; and it robs us of the sweetness which we might otherwise have experienced.

(2) Hindrance to sanctifying grace.

Venial sins often hinder graces which GOD otherwise would give us, and especially hinder our reception of sanctifying grace. As we have seen, every Sacrament conveys two kinds of grace,—the grace of the Sacrament, or Sacramental grace, and sanctifying grace; and while we always receive the grace of the Sacrament when our souls are in a state of grace, venial sins often hinder the working of the sanctifying grace which would otherwise increase our habitual grace.

(3) Preparation of the soul for mortal sin.

But the greatest evil of venial sin is that it disposes and prepares the soul for mortal sin. Just as slight sicknesses often reduce the strength of a man and render him more susceptible to great diseases, so lesser sins prepare the way for greater. As an illustration we may take a charred beam in a house, which may smoulder for a long while before the fire breaks out. Some day, however, a draught of air reaches the

smouldering wood, and soon the whole beam is in a blaze, and the house perhaps destroyed. So it is with many classes of venial sin; by weakening the will, they prepare the way for some great fall. "White lies," as they are sometimes called, prepare the way for downright falsehoods; little exhibitions of temper, for some great act of passion.

(4) Diversion of the will.

Venial sins often divert, or pervert, the inclination of our will. The will should be directed absolutely to GOD; that is to say, GOD should be our "end," and conformity to His will the law of our life. Venial sins hinder this conformity, greatly divert the will and turn it aside from a perfect course; just as on a windy day an arrow shot at a mark misses it because it has been diverted from its true aim by the force of the wind.

(5) Grieving of the HOLY GHOST.

Again, we gather from S. Paul that as by mortal sin we quench the HOLY GHOST, so by venial sin we grieve the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD, whereby we are "sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. iv. 30).

There are other ways in which venial sin hinders the growth of the soul, so that no one has any right to be satisfied with his spiritual life unless he is earnestly striving against all sin, even venial sin.

4. Omission and commission.

Actual sin may be divided not only into mortal and venial, but also into sins of omission and commission. Sins of commission have been treated already in what has been said above.

i. Sins of commission.

ii. Sins of omission.

(1) Their number and extent.

The gravity of sins of omission is lamentably overlooked. There are few who realize the frequency with which people are guilty of such sins, and how much is left undone of man's duty to GOD, to his neighbour, and to himself.

(2) Their greatness in GOD'S sight.

Few, again, consider how great in the sight of GOD is the guilt of leaving undone the things which we ought to do. It is a most startling fact that in the Gospels all sins which merited the loss of the soul (with one exception, the sin of Judas) were sins of *omission*. In the Parables of the Rich Man and Lazarus, of the Pounds, of the Talents, of the Ten Virgins,—in every case it was not a sin of commission that was so fearfully punished, but the sin of leaving duty *undone*. The rich man who passed the beggar by, the man with the one pound and the one talent who did not use it, and the foolish virgins,—all alike found themselves among the goats on the left hand, and heard the sentence "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." Yet men often comfort themselves with the idea that they have not done any harm in their lives, that they have not committed any very great sin! GOD did not create us only in order that we might do no harm, commit no sin, but He created us that we might *do His will*, that we might glorify Him by useful lives; and if our life has been a wasted life, it has been a sinful life.

5. Sins of thought, word, and deed.

There are three ways in which any sin may be committed,—in thought, word, and deed.

1. Sins of thought.

People sometimes suppose that they are not responsible for sins of thought, or at least that sins of thought which are not carried out into action are not sins at all. Nothing can be more untrue, for our Blessed Lord, in giving that sad list of sins in the fifteenth chapter of S. Matthew, puts "evil thoughts" at the very head of the list: "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies" (S. Matt. xv. 19); and again, in the Sermon on the Mount, He shows that the Sixth and Sev-

enth Commandments can be broken in thought and feeling as well as in act (S. Matt. v. 22 and 28). And in the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican in the Temple, He shows that it is possible to commit mortal sin in thought; for the Pharisee lived a most exemplary life in respect of the external observance of the law, but he was not "justified" because of a sin in thought—pride (S. Luke xviii. 10–15).

When evil thoughts become sins.

Temptations in thought become sins only when they have been consented to. That is, the Tempter may have power to suggest to us a train of thought which at first is not wrong, but tends in a wrong direction, and such thoughts may be in our minds for some minutes without our being conscious that they are wrong. If we put them away the moment that conscience tells us they are wrong, there is no sin. If, however, after conscience has spoken we go on with the train of thought because it is pleasant, we are then sinning.

ii. Sins of word.

How solemnly our Blessed Lord has warned us "that every idle word that men shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment" (S. Matt. xii. 36). And yet how carelessly we engage in conversation on matters which lead us to sins, especially against humility and against charity! "Set a watch, O LORD, before my mouth: and keep the door of my lips," (Ps. cxli. 3) is a prayer we need constantly to use in regard to our words.

iii. Sins of deed.

Sins of deed have been discussed above, and it is unnecessary to add to what has been said on the subject.

III. Self-examination.

Having gained some knowledge of the nature and characteristics of sin, we are now in a position to make our self-examination. To make a good self-examination is not an easy task, because of four difficulties which are always more or less with us.

1. Four difficulties.

i. Familiarity with sin.

First, there is a familiarity with sin, which comes from our daily contact with the sinful world. In the world sin is all around us. We inhale, as it were, an atmosphere charged with sin. We hear so much about it that we lose the delicate sensitiveness which would enable us to detect sin at once.

ii. False views of sin.

Then the world's view of sin is so utterly false that unless we are very careful we are in danger of accepting altogether wrong views of sin. For the world thinks lightly of all those sins which it has not especially condemned by its own code of morals. It considers those sins very bad which its tribunals punish, or which occasion the loss of one's character; but all others are regarded as very light; so that really the greatest sin in the world's estimation is "being found out." The world practically says, "Do what you like, only don't be found out."

The world calls sins by euphemistic names and then forgets that they are sins; as, when a young man is living in intemperance, impurity, wasting his glorious manhood, outraging the holiness of GOD, and often ruining his fellow-creatures, the world speaks of him as only "sowing his wild oats." The world has a sort of theory of the necessity of sin, that we cannot help sinning, and therefore need not worry very much about it. If this were the case, if we really could not help sinning, GOD, Who is Justice, could not punish us for it.

People make excuses for their sins by blaming their circumstances, and those among whom they work. But the answer is very simple,—these things are only temptations, and if we use the means of grace diligently we shall have strength to resist them; or if not, we have no business to remain in such surroundings.

iii. Self-deception.

Again, our own deceitful heart (Jer. xvii. 9) and our self-love make it extremely difficult for us to obtain a really just estimate of ourselves, and to see how mean, proud, etc., we are.

iv. The deceits of the devil.

And, worse than all, there is ever by our side a lying spirit whose one work is to deceive us regarding our true condition, lest, horrified by our sins, we should indeed repent and escape from his bondage. So, as we think over our sins, the devil is always ready to whisper in our ear plausible reasons why we need not think *that* sin so very bad, and to remind us rather of all our noble intentions and holy aspirations, although they probably never produced any fruit at all.

2. The remedy the help of the HOLY GHOST.

The remedy for these three difficulties is the help of the HOLY GHOST. He must convince us of sin if we are ever truly to know ourselves (S. John xvi. 8). We must begin our self-examination as the woman in the parable began seeking her lost piece of silver, by lighting a candle, the candle of the HOLY GHOST, before we can sweep the house of our soul of the sins which defile it. That is, we must begin our self-examination with earnest prayer to the HOLY GHOST to help us to know our sins, to prevent us from deceiving ourselves about them, to convince us of our guilt; and we must have a great desire to find out everything, that we may not overlook some darling sin lurking in the innermost recesses of our soul, but that the light of the HOLY GHOST may penetrate everywhere, revealing the dust of sin which has been accumulating perhaps for very many years.

Parable of the lost piece of silver.

3. Method of self-examination.

Let us suppose that we are about to make an examination of our whole life, as, for instance, before our first confession, or at some great crisis in our life.

i. Divisions of life.

We should begin by dividing our life into periods,—childhood, school-life, etc. Recall companions, scenes, and places where we have lived, and examine each period separately.

ii. Questions on the Commandments and Deadly Sins.

Then use some set of questions on the Ten Commandments or on the seven Deadly Sins. Such questions may be found in most books of devotion. One of the most helpful books of this sort is Canon Carter's "Manual of Repentance." Read the Sermon on the Mount.

iii. Result to be written.

Do a little at a time and write down what you find out, not perhaps in full, but sufficient to remind you of the sins you have discovered. When you have finished read them over on your knees in the presence of GOD, and ask yourself whether this is what you think is written in the book of Judgment.

iv. Prayer for aid.

Pray a great deal while making your self-examination, and think of Death and Judgment, of the lost in Hell, and the Saints in Heaven. Pray that you may not overlook anything that GOD wills you to confess; and pray much for the grace of contrition that you may be truly sorry for all the sins of your life.

CHAPTER XIII.

CONDITIONS REQUIRED FOR PENITENCE.

Introductory.

IN the last chapter we treated of the remote matter of penitence, that is the sins on which the grace of Absolution acts; and we saw that self-examination was the means by which they were to be discovered so that they might be brought to the Tribunal of Mercy and there washed away by the Precious Blood of CHRIST. We must now in the same way consider the *proximate* matter of the Sacrament, or the conditions which we must fulfil in order that we may receive all the benefits of Absolution.

The three conditions.

The conditions are three: Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction.

I. Contrition.

The first, Contrition, is the most important, since if it is perfect it ensures the forgiveness of all sin, because it necessarily includes in itself the two other conditions which may be considered as its fruits.

1. Definition.

What is Contrition? Contrition is sorrow for sin, but not every sort of sorrow,—not sorrow on account of what we have lost by our sin, the joy of Communion with GOD here, and the happiness of Heaven hereafter. Nor is it that sorrow which is caused by fear of punishment, whether we regard the penal results of sin in this life or the eternal punishment of it in Hell. Contrition is that sorrow for sin which flows from the

love of GOD in our souls. It is really our love for GOD in its relation to our sin. S. Teresa once said that she wished that the fires of Hell might be quenched and the beauties of Heaven burnt up, in order that men might learn to love GOD for Himself alone. Contrition is that sorrow which comes from our realization of the way in which we have outraged GOD'S love by our sin.

i. Attrition.

We can readily see that it is not easy to stir up real Contrition in our cold, selfish hearts, and often we have to be satisfied with an inferior sorrow which theologians call "Attrition," and which arises rather from fear than love. In Attrition there must be a detestation of sin, with a resolve to sin no more; but it differs from Contrition in the motive of this detestation. Perfect Contrition is founded on the motive of love; Attrition on any other supernatural motive, even on the fear of the punishments which sin involves, either in this world, in Purgatory, or in Hell.

ii. Its relation to Contrition.

S. Augustine in his commentary on the first Epistle of S. John, when treating of that verse which says, "Perfect love casteth out fear," remarks that fear is like the needle and love like the thread which we use in sewing. The needle is necessary to puncture the material and make a way for the thread to follow; but the needle is drawn out, while the thread is left in the material. So many a repentance may begin with fear and end with love, the fear first piercing the hard heart with compunction, and the love flowing in afterwards and binding the soul to GOD.

So while Attrition, together with the Sacrament of Penance, may be sufficient for the forgiveness of sin, we must not suffer ourselves to rest until we have attained to a perfect Contrition for all our sins.

2. Signs of Contrition.

What are the signs of Contrition? We must remember that in the Catholic Church "feelings" do not count for very much, that is, they are not certain signs of a spiritual life. They may be accompaniments to it which beautify it, as the leaves beautify the tree; and they may help us to inhale, as it were, the goodness and love of GOD, as the leaves enable the tree to breathe in the carbon which it needs for its tissue. But our Blessed Lord shows us in the cursing of the fig-tree (S. Matt. xxi. 19) that He seeks something more than leaves, that He demands fruit. And this He teaches us more than once in His ministry, for, "He spake also this parable; A certain man had a fig-tree planted in his vineyard; and he came and sought fruit thereon, and found none. Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig-tree, and find none: cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground? And he answering said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it: and if it bear fruit, well: and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down." (S. Luke xiii. 6–9). Here the tree probably produced plenty of leaves, but no fruit. And in another place our Lord says: "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit . . . Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them" (S. Matt. vii. 17 and 20).

Fruits demanded.

What, then, are the fruits by which we may judge of the completeness of our Contrition?

i. Readiness to confess.

Firstly, there is readiness to *confess* our sins. The prodigal when he came to himself said, "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned" (S. Luke xv. 18). A child that comes to its mother and says, "I am sorry I have done wrong," goes on to say what the wrong is. The

first sign of true Contrition is a desire to confess our sins.

ii. Readiness to amend.

Secondly, there is readiness to *forsake* our sins. The prodigal did not go back to his evil life after he had made his Confession; he stayed in his father's house. We must have a great desire for amendment.

iii. Readiness to avoid temptation.

Thirdly, readiness to keep out of the way of sin, to give up occasions of sin; for example, people and circumstances which tempt us. We cannot have true Contrition if we mean to go back into temptation. Sometimes this fruit will cost us a great deal. It may be necessary to give up a dear friend who has led us astray; for we cannot have real Contrition if we hesitate between a friend and GOD. And we are only deceiving ourselves if we suppose that we can go into temptation of our own deliberate will and still expect GOD to take care of us.

iv. Readiness to forgive.

Fourthly, readiness to forgive others who have sinned against us. Our Lord has said, "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your FATHER forgive your trespasses" (S. Matt. vi. 15); and every time we say the Lord's Prayer we say, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us."

v. Readiness to make satisfaction.

Lastly, a readiness to make satisfaction for our sins, primarily to GOD by bearing patiently the temporal penalty which our sin involves; and secondarily to man, by making restitution, if it be possible, where we have wronged our neighbour.

If we have all these signs of Contrition we ought to feel very happy, for it is a proof that we have the love of GOD in our hearts, and that alone ensures the forgiveness of our sins. But if any one of these signs is wanting, it shows that our Contrition is imperfect, and we should pray GOD to help us to acquire that fruit of Contrition which is lacking in us.

How can we get Contrition? We must pray for it at the foot of the Cross, for the Cross is the Fountain of Contrition; meditate on the Passion of CHRIST; contemplate the details of His Sufferings; gaze upon the crucifix, and see written there in great black characters our sins. Ask the HOLY GHOST to help us to realize how great our sins have been, and then think of the immensity of GOD'S love, Who "so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten SON, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (S. John iii. 16). If we do this earnestly, unless indeed our heart be harder than stone, we shall have Contrition. 3. How to get Contrition.

The second condition required is Confession. As we have already observed, Confession and Satisfaction are really fruits of Contrition and are essentially contained in it; but as they are of great importance, we will treat each of them separately. II. Confession.

What is Confession? Confession is telling our sins to GOD. When Adam sinned, GOD called him to Confession. All people are agreed thus far about Confession *to GOD*, but very few *do it*. Those who do not use Confession to a priest are something like those who say they do not go to Church because they can say their prayers and read their Bible at home. We know that they are generally the people who do *not* say their prayers or read their Bible. So those who are most loud in their protestations that they believe in Confession to GOD alone are generally those who do not make Confession to GOD; often because they have very little idea of what Confession to GOD involves. For Confession to GOD requires a particular knowledge of the sins which we have to confess; and few people make much progress in self-examination and self-knowledge who do not use the Sacrament of Penance. 1. Definition.

Frequent unreality of Confession to GOD alone.

Form of Confiteor addressed to GOD.

In this Sacrament we confess our sins to GOD. As the form of the Confiteor says, "I confess to GOD Almighty, the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, to the whole Company of Heaven, and to you, my father, that I have sinned." But we confess to GOD in the presence of His representative, the priest, who is a man like ourselves.

Confession in the Bible.

The Bible is full of instances of Confession to man, for example, Achan to Joshua (Josh. vii. 19–21); the Jew to S. John the Baptist (S. Matt. iii. 6); the Ephesians to S. Paul (Acts xix. 18); the sick man to the Elders of the Church (S. James v. 14-16).

All people believe in Confession to man.

And, though they would probably not admit it, all people believe in Confession to man. If a man has committed murder and has been tried and found guilty, the sentiment of society demands that he should confess his sin before he is executed. And if the man goes to his death without this confession, people say he cannot be penitent, and so are doubtful of his salvation. Again, if any one has wronged us, as in the case of a domestic who has stolen from us, we often make confession the condition of forgiveness.

The more we pursue this thought in the experiences of daily life, the more we shall be driven to the conclusion that all people believe in Confession to man. But there is this difference of opinion: that some think is necessary only for *other* people, while others, with a greater sense of justice, feel that it is necessary also for themselves.

2. Benefits of Confession to a man.

Here we may ask, What are the benefits to man, that is, to *a* man, of Confession?

i. Sympathy.

There is, first, the benefit of sympathy; and what a wonderful power sympathy is! When a sin has been confessed, what a weight is taken off our soul! We

have some one else to help us to bear its burden, and his sympathy inspires us with hope for better things, and changes the whole prospect of our life from gloom to brightness.

ii. Self-knowledge.

Confession is one of the greatest helps to self-knowledge. As long as we make our self-examination without Confession, self-examination is usually very unreal. It is like preparing a speech which is never to be delivered, into the preparation of which we therefore do not throw ourselves earnestly. As the reality of our penitence depends to a large extent on our self-knowledge, this benefit of Confession is most important.

iii. Humility

Then, Confession will humble you very much. And many people for this reason say, "I will never make my Confession to a man—it is so humiliating!" This is very true, but then is pride a virtue, or a deadly sin? And did not our Lord say, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted"? (S. Luke xiv. 11). He did not say, "He that is humbled by some one else," but "He that humbleth himself"; and in what way can we do this so effectually or so justly as in Confession? Humility is the foundation of all Christian virtues, and if we are too proud to make our Confession there must be something very wrong in the fundamental principle of our spiritual life.

iv. Help to contrition.

Confession also deepens sorrow, and so is a great help to Contrition; indeed it often takes the imperfect attrition with which we approach the Sacrament and converts it into Contrition. Many whose hearts are cold and who have little feeling of sorrow find that as they make their Confession the flood-gates are unlocked and tears of true sorrow begin to flow.

v. Counsel.

In Confession, too, we get good advice concerning our practical struggle with sin. When we are in doubt

in the matters of daily life we seek the advice of some friend in whose judgment we have confidence. How much more should we do so in those matters which concern our eternal salvation!

3. Reasons for making Confession to a priest.

Why should we go to a priest to make our Confession?

i. He is trained to give counsel.

In so important and delicate a matter it is well to go to one who has had experience, who has made a study of such matters. It is a priest's "business" to advise in matters of the soul, just as it is the business of a doctor to advise us in regard to the diseases of our body, and that of a lawyer to advise us in regard to difficulties which arise concerning our worldly estate. There is an old saying that "a man who is his own lawyer has a fool for his client," and it is probably equally true of a man who is his own director. If we are in great pain we do not go to some trusted friend, of whose goodness we are convinced, and ask him to prescribe for us, but we go to a doctor in whose skill we have faith. So in the ailments of the soul we should not go merely to some good friend who has never made such things a study and has had no experience in regard to them, but to a priest whose work it is to deal with such matters, and who in addition to having studied them carefully, has also the special guidance of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT which is given to the priesthood. For we are told that "the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the LORD of Hosts" (Mal. ii. 7).

Others are not.

ii. A priest represents the Church.

We should go to a priest because he represents the Church, the Body of CHRIST, which we have injured by our sins, and to which, therefore, we should make Confession.

If we merely go to a friend to get his advice in regard to our sins, he is bound, perhaps, in honour not to talk about what we have said; but a priest is bound not only in honour but under peril of mortal sin and under the gravest ecclesiastical penalty. According to Canon 113 of the Canons of A.D. 1603 the penalty of any breach of the seal of Confession is "irregularity," that is, disability to exercise the priestly office.

iii. The Sacramental seal.

But the great reason why we make our Confessions to a priest is in order that we may obtain Absolution; for to *no one else* did CHRIST give the power to remit sin when He said, as He breathed on His Apostles, "Receive ye the HOLY GHOST: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (S. John xx. 22, 23). And these words, which in our Church constitute part of the ordinary form of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, were said to every priest at the moment of his ordination.

iv. Absolution.

Why did CHRIST say these words, and why has the Church perpetuated them? Not, as some seem to think, as an interesting verse in the Bible, or a curious relic of antiquity retained in the Church, but that men may use the power they convey for the remission of sins.

We have learned in the last chapter how to prepare for our Confession, so far as regards finding out our sins by self-examination. In addition to this we need to come to our Confession:

4. How to make a good Confession.

(1) With great sorrow for our sins.

(2) With faith in the power of the Precious Blood of CHRIST to cleanse us from all sin.

(3) With entire sincerity; because we desire to tell all our sins. To be insincere is sacrilegious, for it is lying,

not unto man, but unto GOD the HOLY GHOST, as Ananias and Sapphira did (Acts v. 3).

(4) With a firm purpose of amendment of life, for without this there can be no true penitence.

(5) With hope of pardon. This was what the Confession of Judas lacked; it was full and entire, but he had no hope that he could be forgiven. So sin against the HOLY GHOST is sometimes the absolute loss of hope of pardon, that is, the sin of despair, which so long as it lasts places us beyond the reach of forgiveness.

5. Practical hints.

These are the five dispositions required for a good Confession; to which we may add some practical hints:

(1) Say many prayers and make many acts of contrition while preparing for Confession.

(2) Follow some definite order, as already suggested in the questions on the Commandments or on the Deadly Sins.

(3) Keep in mind three things in Confession: it is required (a) to tell all; (b) to give some idea of the number of times the sin was committed, whether it was occasional or habitual; and (c) to say whether it was aggravated by any circumstances.

(4) Always make a good thanksgiving after receiving Absolution. Remember that to obtain that Absolution GOD was made Man, lived and died.

(5) Always do the imposed penance very exactly and carefully. It is a test of sincerity.

(6) Avoid mentioning the *names* of others in Confession.

III. Satisfaction.

The third condition required is Satisfaction. All penitence, as we have already said, is summed up in Contrition; Confession and Satisfaction being only its fruits or results. Where they are wanting our Contrition is shown to be imperfect.

1. Definition.

What is Satisfaction? Satisfaction has been defined *actively* as "a compensation for wounded honour or for an injury inflicted"; *objectively* as "the work done, the obedience rendered or the price paid, in consideration of which justice is satisfied, and by which compensation for injury is made, either by the offender or by another in his stead."

The Satisfaction of CHRIST

"JESUS CHRIST alone, Who is both GOD and Man," says Bossuet, "was capable, through the infinite dignity of His Person, of offering to GOD satisfaction for our sins. And having satisfied superabundantly (on account of the infinite value of the price He offered), He was able to apply this satisfaction in two ways; either by granting entire remission, without letting any penalty remain, or, on the other hand, by commuting a greater into a lesser penalty, that is, eternal into temporal punishment. The first He employs in Baptism, wherein He remits not only sin but also all punishment, both temporal and eternal, due to that sin; the second He uses in the case of those who fall back into sin after Baptism, being, as it were, constrained to do so by the ingratitude of those who have abused His first Gifts, so that they have to suffer some punishment, although the eternal punishment is remitted. We must not from this infer that JESUS CHRIST failed to make entire satisfaction for us, but, on the contrary, that having acquired an absolute right over us by the infinite price He has offered for our salvation, He grants us pardon on the conditions, under the laws and with the reserves which seem good to Him."

applied in Baptism,

and in Penance.

Temporal punishment for pardoned sin.

Scripture proves that GOD inflicts temporal punishment for pardoned sin. Moses obtained pardon for the murmuring Israelites, yet they were nearly all punished with death. (Num. xiv. 20-24). Again, we

The Israelites.

David.

find that after David had acknowledged his crime, Nathan said to him, "The LORD also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die. Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the LORD to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die." (2 Sam. xii. 13,14). And again, Daniel says to Nebuchadnezzar: "Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off [redeem] thy sins by righteousness [almsgiving], and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." (Dan. iv. 27). This passage occurs in the Chaldee portion of Daniel, and the word translated in our version "break off" can only mean "redeem." The word translated "righteousness" is in the Septuagint rendered "almsgiving."

Nebuchadnezzar.

The sense in which "satisfaction" is used of man.

When, therefore, we speak of making Satisfaction, we do not mean that anything that we can do *of ourselves* can possibly make Satisfaction to the justice of GOD. Our Lord made this Satisfaction for us once for all; but as members of His Body we are called to share in some small degree in that work of Satisfaction. Our Lord bore the Cross for us, and yet He has told us that unless we take up our cross daily and follow Him we cannot be His disciples. Our Lord now in Heaven "ever liveth to make intercession" for us (Heb. vii. 25), and yet He has told us to pray, and taught us that on our prayer must depend very largely the gifts and blessings which we need.

As, then, we have to share in His work of intercession, and yet He is our only Mediator; so we have to make Satisfaction for our sins, although He made "a full, perfect, and sufficient . . . satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

We may, therefore, look upon our work of Satisfac-

tion as twofold: (1) that which as members of CHRIST we make for the sins of the Church—as S. Paul teaches when he writes to the Colossians: "I . . . rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of CHRIST in my flesh for His Body's sake, which is the Church" (Col. i. 24),—and (2) that temporal penance for post-baptismal sin which GOD sees fit to inflict on us for our good and for the satisfaction of His justice.

Two effects of mortal sin.

Two effects follow upon every mortal sin committed against grace (that is, after Baptism): guilt and punishment. The guilt is remitted through Absolution, when the soul is cleansed from all sin by the Precious Blood of JESUS CHRIST; and the eternal punishment due to sin is also remitted. But a certain amount of punishment, varying according to GOD'S will and called the "temporal" punishment of sin, is left to be borne by the penitent sinner either here or in Purgatory.

i. Guilt.

ii. Punishment.

The debt of this temporal punishment, however, can be paid much more readily in this life, because here we can merit. For we can do good works and endure evil voluntarily, and the essential value of our offering depends upon its being a willing one. In the Intermediate State the wills of those who are saved are absolutely conformed to GOD'S will; they are confirmed in grace. And as there can be no further temptation and therefore no possibility of choice or of sin, the suffering of Purgatory cannot be meritorious like that which we willingly endure in this life.

Penance imposed by the priest.

The penance imposed by the priest in the Sacrament is, of course, only a part of the Satisfaction which we have to make, the real penance being sent us by GOD in the crosses and pains and difficulties of our life. It

is also frequently *remedial*, that is to say, it helps us to overcome the sins which have been confessed; and it is a test of our obedience to the laws of GOD and of His Church,—our sins, of course, having all been the result of disobedience.

2. Elements of Satisfaction.

There are several elements which go to make up the idea of Satisfaction.

i. Amendment.

Among these we may first notice amendment, positive and negative; that is, the doing our duty and the giving up of sin. We must not be satisfied only with the last, as a very large number of our sins have been sins of omission. We cannot really amend our lives without striving earnestly to do our duty in the state of life unto which it has pleased GOD to call us.

ii. Restitution.

Then there is restitution. This is an absolutely essential part of Satisfaction. For though GOD has committed great powers to His Church, not even the Church can remit the duty of restitution where the sinner has it in his power to make it.

iii. Penance.

Next there is penance. We must bear patiently the pains and sufferings and temptations which are the temporal punishment of our sins; doing our penance willingly and exactly, and perhaps trying to do more, for S. Paul speaks of "revenge" being wrought in us as a part of the godly sorrow, the true repentance. (2 Cor. vii. 11).

iv. Reparation.

Lastly, there is reparation. If we are truly penitent we shall desire to do something to show GOD our penitence, for inasmuch as by our sins we have dishonoured GOD, we should try to find something by which to add to His accidental glory. Under this head would come:

(1) Works of mercy.

(2) Special offerings made for the work of the Church.

(3) Zeal in helping other souls, and especially in bringing sinners to repentance.

(4) A very great horror and detestation of sin.

Thus we conclude this most important subject. Like the gatherers of samphire who trust their lives to the single rope by which they are let down over some lofty cliff, so, as we have all sinned, must we trust ourselves to the rope of penitence in the awful moment of suspense over the abyss of eternity. How careful, then, should we be that each one of the three strands of which that rope is composed should be quite perfect! Unutterably sad indeed it must be for those who pass from this world into eternity to find at the Particular Judgment that they have deceived themselves concerning either their Contrition, or Confession, or Satisfaction—and that they were not really sorry for their sins, or that they did not sincerely confess them all, or that they did not make that amendment and satisfaction for sin, which was an essential part of their penitence. Conclusion

Those, however, who use the Sacrament of Penance well, approaching it with right dispositions, can look with calmness on the Four Last Things—Death, Judgment, Hell, Heaven—comforted by the assurance which comes from the promise of JESUS CHRIST Himself that their sins are forgiven.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.—AS A SACRAMENT.

Introductory.

1. Definition, etc.

THE Holy Eucharist is the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord JESUS CHRIST which are present under the forms of bread and wine. It was instituted by Him as the means whereby we may (1) continually show forth the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST until He come, and (2) feed upon Him as our spiritual food and nourishment.

The Fathers are never weary of praising the excellences of this most Venerable Sacrament, and the Angelical Doctor writes of this ineffable Mystery in the lines of the well-known "Lauda Sion":

> "Quantum potes, tantum aude;
> Quia major omni laude,
> Nec laudare sufficis."

Titles.

With Its titles the Fathers never seemed content, but were constantly inventing new names of honour for the great centre of the Church's worship. They speak of the Eucharist as "a most holy, divine, tremendous Mystery"; they call It "the Breaking of Bread," "the Eucharistic Thanksgiving," "the Supper of the Lord," "the Sacrament of the Altar," "the Holy

Communion," "the Bread of Angels," "the Corn of the Mighty," "the Heavenly Manna," "the Viaticum," and "the Marrige Supper of the Lamb."

Excellences.

It is the most excellent of all the Sacraments, for It contains their Author in Person, and is the end for which all the others were instituted. It has been likened to the centre of a wheel, and the other Sacraments to the spokes, or radii, which all tend to the centre; since that union with CHRIST which Baptism effects is but a preparation for the perfection of union in this Sacrament. In the other Sacraments our Lord by His ministers confers grace by the use of consecrated symbols. In this Sacrament He Himself is present, and through closest union with Himself pours grace most abundantly into our souls. In this sense the Eucharist is called the Sacrament of Sacraments, not only because It surpasses all others in excellence of dignity, so that It is called the Holy of Holies,—but also in order still more to set forth the relation and subordination of the others to this "the Queen of Sacraments."

Types.

The dignity of the Holy Eucharist was foreshadowed by numerous types in the Old Testament, beginning with the Tree of Life in the first Paradise, and extending throughout the history of the Jews and through almost all the ceremonies of their worship. Among these types we may notice the sacrifices of Abel and Melchizedek, the Paschal Lamb, the Manna, and the Shewbread. But were we to enumerate all, the list would be indeed a long one.

Institution.

The Holy Eucharist was instituted by our Lord Himself on the last night of His earthly life, in the upper chamber at Jerusalem. There, having partaken of the Last Supper with His Apostles, He instituted this great Sacrament of His love, following It with those

pathetic discourses which were His last teachings to His Apostles before He passed to the scene in Gethsemane, and the beginning of His Passion.

We find an account of the institution in the Gospels of S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke, and in the eleventh chapter of S. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians. These accounts, while differing slightly in details, agree perfectly in all their essential parts, and they have been summed up by our Church in the words of the Canon, or Consecration Prayer, as follows: "In the night in which He was betrayed, He took Bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat, THIS IS MY BODY, Which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise, after supper, He took the Cup; and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for THIS IS MY BLOOD of the New Testament, Which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink It, in remembrance of Me."

The agent.

The agent in the Holy Eucharist, as in all the other Sacraments, is the HOLY GHOST. The Fathers were fond of using the Incarnation as an illustration of the Blessed Sacrament; and we may say that as the HOLY GHOST at the Feast of the Annunciation came upon the Blessed Virgin Mary, and by His operation our Lord JESUS CHRIST became present in her; so, when the priest pronounces the words of Consecration, the HOLY GHOST comes down upon the elements of bread and wine, and by His operation that bread and wine become the Body and Blood of our Lord JESUS CHRIST. It is necessary, however, to remember that this is but an analogy, and must not be pressed too far.

We may also observe that while the HOLY SPIRIT is the agent, our Lord is the true Priest, as well as the Victim, in the Holy Sacrifice, and the priest who celebrates at the altar is only His representative.

Our Lord both Victim and Priest.

The Holy Eucharist differs from all the other Sacraments in that while they have only the outward part and the inward *grace*, the Holy Eucharist has inseparably united to the inward *part* or Res Sacramenti the Person of CHRIST Himself.

The terminology of our Catechism is taken from S. Augustine, who speaks of the "Sacramentum," or outward part; the "Res Sacramenti," or inward part, the Body and Blood of CHRIST which, however, cannot be separated from CHRIST Himself; and the "Virtus Sacramenti," or benefits of grace conferred.

A third division in this Sacrament.

Like all other Sacraments the Holy Eucharist has matter and form. The matter of the Eucharist is simply bread and wine. The bread must be wheaten bread, either leavened or unleavened. In the Eastern Church the former is used, in the Western Church the latter. The wine must be the fermented juice of the grape. Vinegar or "unfermented wine" is not valid matter.

II. The essentials of the Sacrament.
1. Matter. Bread.

Wine.

By ecclesiastical precept a little water is mingled with the wine, because our Lord is believed to have used wine mingled with water at the institution of the Eucharist, in accordance with the universal Jewish custom; and because various mystical meanings are thus symbolized, particularly the union of the Divinity and Humanity in CHRIST. The quantity of water is so small that it is assimilated to the wine and ceases to exist as water, so that in the consecration of the Chalice wine only is consecrated. The mixed chalice, however, is not necessary to the *validity* of the Consecration.

Mixed chalice.

2. Form.

The form of the Eucharist consists of the words of Consecration. That is, the priest says the very words and does the acts which our Lord JESUS CHRIST did; although probably the acts are not absolutely essential.

Western view.

In the West theologians teach that the words, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," are sufficient form, so that even if these words alone were uttered by a priest over proper matter, without any other form, the Consecration would be *valid* though irregular.

Eastern view.

In the East, however, an Invocation of the HOLY GHOST follows the words of institution,—though not immediately, the oblation of the Sacrifice coming between them;—and Eastern theologians teach that the whole form of the words, that is the Consecration, the Oblation, and the Invocation of the HOLY SPIRIT, is essential to a valid Consecration. They regard this as *one undivided and continuous act*, the act of Consecration.

Eastern view examined.

But this opinion raises most serious difficulties and is probably (1) neither correct, (2) nor really ancient.

1. It is incorrect; as appears (1) from Bessarion's testimony.

It seems to be *incorrect* for two reasons. First, because, as Bessarion clearly explains, these liturgical invocations of the HOLY SPIRIT ought to be referred not to the time at which they are uttered, but to the time in regard to which they are spoken. For the prayer is made with regard to the time when the change, which that Invocation of the HOLY SPIRIT declares, actually takes place; that is, to the time at which the consecratory words of CHRIST, "This is My Body," are uttered by the priest. Doubtless the operation of the HOLY SPIRIT through the words of Consecration is not successive and gradual, but instantaneous; the declaration, however, of this in prayers and words must be successive. Therefore, whilst the transmutation first takes place through the words of Consecration,

and then the HOLY SPIRIT is asked to effect it, we are to understand that this latter prayer belongs to the one sacrificial action, and is to be referred to the time at which the change takes place. Nor is the Invocation intended for any other purpose than to declare more definitely this very transmutation, and to manifest it to the faithful. (Bessarion. De Eucharistia. Bibl. Max. PP., T. xxvi., page 796.)

(2). From the general action of prayer.

Further, we may observe that this is the general action of prayer,—that it refers not so much to the moment when the prayer is uttered as to some other time of need. Since the prayer of Invocation cannot be spoken at the same moment with the words of Consecration, it must either precede or follow them. In the Liturgy of the Roman Church it precedes them, and also in the English Prayer-Book; although in both these cases it is addressed to the FATHER, and the work of the HOLY SPIRIT is only implicitly referred to. In the Greek Liturgy, as we have already said, the Invocation follows the Oblation. In the Western Liturgies, therefore, the action of the prayer of Invocation is to be referred to the moment of Consecration. In the Eastern it is to be found potentially present at that moment, although the prayer is not actually uttered until a few moments later.

(3). From the position of the Oblation.

But there is a far stronger argument against the Eastern position. Although the Greeks at the present day speak of the form of Consecration as one undivided and continuous act (the act of Consecration, extending from the words of Consecration, through the Oblation, to the end of the Invocation proper); yet this fails to meet the difficulty that at the moment when the Oblation is offered it either is or is not the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST. If it is not, then it is no sacrifice, for

nothing more is being offered than was offered when the bread and wine were placed upon the altar. But as the purpose for which the Holy Eucharist was instituted was primarily to be the Propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of the world (and therefore the chief end of the Consecration is sacrifice), the Body and Blood of CHRIST must be present when the Oblation is made. Now the Oblation takes place in the Greek Liturgy between the words of Consecration and the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST. Therefore, while the Greeks may endeavour to avoid the difficulty by assuming that it is all one act, this is surely an incorrect position, for the only sacrifice of any avail we can offer is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST. This is of the more interest to us since both the Scottish and American Liturgies follow the Greek use and place the Invocation of the HOLY SPIRIT *after* the Oblation.

ii. It lacks antiquity.

Nor can this opinion of the Greek Church claim *antiquity*. For although the Epiklesis, or Invocation of the HOLY GHOST, is found after the Oblation in all the Eastern Liturgies, even those of the schismatical and heretical sects, yet at the Council of Florence in 1439, when the Greek Bishops were asked by the Latins: "In what way do you understand your addition of that prayer to the aforesaid words of CHRIST ["This is My Body"] and to the sacred Gifts consecrated by these words, in which you say, 'And make this bread the Precious Body of Thy CHRIST, changing it by Thy HOLY SPIRIT'?"—the Greeks removed the difficulty thus: "We have said that we admit by these words [of institution] that the Divine bread is consecrated and is made the Body of CHRIST; but afterwards, in the same manner as you yourselves say, 'Command these gifts to be borne by the hands of

Council of Florence.

Thy Holy Angel to Thine Altar on high,' so we also pray, saying, 'May the HOLY SPIRIT descend upon us and make this bread *to us* the Precious Body of Thy CHRIST, and let what is in the chalice be the Precious Blood of Thy CHRIST; and may He transmute these Gifts through His HOLY SPIRIT, that they may be to those who communicate for the cleansing of the soul.'" (Mansi, Vol. xxxi., p. 1006).

In almost the same way is the Invocation explained by John Maro, or the actual author of the Syriac Exposition of the Liturgy of S. James. "The HOLY GHOST is not invoked," says this writer, "that by His descent He may make or change the bread into the Body and the wine into the Blood of our Saviour, but that He may make manifest that these are the Body and Blood of our Lord Himself, and may make them *to those who receive them* for remission of sins and everlasting life." John Maro.

Georgius Coresius brings forward the same explanation amongst schismatics some time after the Council of Florence. "The newness of the opinions is wholly condemned," says he, "which Nicholas Cabasilas has introduced into the Church, attributing the Consecration of the Sacred Gifts to *prayers;* which no one of the holy Fathers ever said, nor any canon laid down; nor is it consonant to the faith of the Church, which by prayers invokes the coming of the HOLY GHOST, not simply (as he says) that He may make the bread the Body and what is in the chalice the Blood, but that He may make them fruitful *in us*."* Georgius Coresius.

From all this, and especially from the last quotation, it is evident that in the fifteenth century the teaching

* All these authorities may be found in *Franzelin, de SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramento.*

that the Epiklesis was essential to the Consecration was a *new* teaching, as Coresius asserts, unknown to any of the Fathers, and not found in any canon of the Church, and even contrary to the faith of the Church.

Speech of Bessarion.

We may gather the same conclusion from the famous speech of Bessarion, Archbishop of Nicae and one of the Greek representatives at the Council of Florence, which is found in Baronius, Vol. xxviii., p. 281, and in Labbe and Cossart, Vol. xiii., p. 1163, quoted from Andreas Santa-Crux. Bessarion spoke as follows:

S. Chrysostom quoted.

"Since from all the holy doctors, and especially from Blessed John Chrysostom himself, we have heard that the words of our Lord are those which change and transubstantiate that bread into the Body of CHRIST and the wine into the Blood, and that these Divine words of our Saviour have all the force of transubstantiation, we necessarily follow this doctor and his opinion. Besides, most blessed Father, we are not ignorant that four things are required in the Consecration of the most precious and venerable Sacrament: first, matter, which ought to be wheaten bread, either leavened or unleavened, because in both there is true consecration; then, that the minister be a priest who has his priesthood from the Church according to the canons; thirdly, form, which is the words of our Saviour, according to the opinion of the aforesaid S. John [Chrysostom]; fourthly, the intention of the priest, that he have the intention to consecrate the bread and wine which have been set apart. This, most blessed Father, have we said briefly, but sufficiently to certify your Holiness and the other Fathers in regard to this question; and your Holiness may rest assured that we, holy Father, always have been,—that we are, and ever shall be in this opinion."

From this we see that Bessarion distinctly asserts that the only form required is the words of our Lord.

We may therefore sum up this important question by saying that in the Western Church and earlier Greek Church the form consists of the words of our Lord Himself, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," together with manual acts and prayer; but that the words alone are probably sufficient (and therefore valid) form. Western view therefore correct.

The minister of the Holy Eucharist must be a priest having valid orders and jurisdiction to celebrate, although this latter does not affect the *validity* of the Sacrament, but only the "regularity" of the act; so that, were a deposed priest to celebrate, while he would grievously sin in disregarding his sentence of deposition, the Eucharist would be valid; and he is permitted to do this in the case of a person *in articulo mortis* where no other priest can be obtained. 3. Minister.

Any duly baptized person can validly receive the Holy Eucharist. An unbaptized person is incapable of receiving this Sacrament. 4. Subject.

For Its beneficial reception certain dispositions are needed which will be dealt with in the chapter on Communion. We need only say here that the Holy Eucharist being one of the Sacraments of the living, and so not conveying first but second grace, it is necessary that the recipient should be in a state of grace, that is free from mortal sin.

The effects of a worthy reception will be treated more fully under the subject of Communion; so that it will now suffice to state briefly the chief direct effects of the Holy Eucharist when received with right dispositions. III. Effects of the Sacrament.

1. On the soul.
i. Perfection and conservation.

It is the means of the perfection and conservation of the supernatural life of the soul through union with CHRIST, Who is the Fountain of all grace. Our Lord's own words are: "If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever: and the Bread which I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (S. John vi. 51). As by food the body is perfected in its growth and preserved by the renewal of its tissues, so by the Holy Eucharist is the soul nourished, that the CHRIST Nature may be increased and preserved within us. The Holy Eucharist accomplishes this by conferring an increase of habitual grace, augmenting the infused virtues and the gifts of the HOLY SPIRIT which were bestowed in Baptism and Confirmation.

ii. Strength and closer union.

The Holy Eucharist strengthens and renders closer our union with CHRIST and with all the members of His Mystical Body, which effect is implied in the mode in which the Sacrament is received; for food becomes united with ourselves (I Cor. x. 17). Our Blessed Lord says, "He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him. As the living FATHER hath sent Me, and I live by the FATHER: so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me" (S. John vi. 56–57).

iii. Remission of sin.

There is also in the Eucharist a remission of sin, which takes place through the action of charity in the soul; for all sin is consumed in the fire of the love of GOD excited in us by our Communions. And this charity diminishes the power of concupiscence, preserves from sin, and remits *venial* sin; though of course this beneficial operation of the Holy Communion depends upon the recipient being free from *mortal* sin.

Some theologians have thought that in certain circumstances It may remit mortal sin, but only acciden-

tally, as, for instance, when a man is disposed through attrition to receive the Holy Communion and communicates in good faith without realizing that he is in mortal sin. This, however, is denied by others, among whom are Vasquez and De Lugo.

2. On the body.

The effects of the Holy Eucharist on the body of the faithful recipient are (1) that in some degree It restores that integrity, which was Adam's great endowment before the Fall. The partially restored integrity (2) lessens the force of desire, or concupiscence, in this life; and (3) prepares the body for a glorious resurrection and immortality in the life to come.

CHAPTER XV.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST—THE REAL PRESENCE.

Introductory.

IN the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist the Body and Blood of CHRIST are present under the forms of bread and wine, that we may continually show forth His Death, and that we may feed on Him. Here clearly we have three questions for our consideration: (1) the nature of the Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist; (2) the nature of the Sacrifice which is there offered; and (3) the effect of the Communion by which our spiritual life is nourished and sustained. We will take these points in order, and consider first the nature of the Presence.

I. Nature of the Presence.

By virtue of the Consecration, the bread and wine without *sensibly* ceasing to be what they were become what they were not before,—the Body and Blood of CHRIST. The proofs of this may be drawn (1) from our Lord's own words, and (2) from the consistent and universal teaching of His Church at all times.

Proofs. 1. From our Lord's words.

In the Gospels of S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke we are distinctly told that our Lord, having taken bread and blessed it, said, "This is My Body," and that after a similar action He said of the contents of the chalice, "This is My Blood."

We read in the first Epistle to the Corinthians that S. Paul, who was not converted until several years after

our Lord's Death, received by direct revelation from CHRIST Himself exactly the same tradition.

And though S. John in his Gospel, (which was written just before the close of the first century,) gives no account of the institution, he records at considerable length a mysterious discourse of our Blessed Lord on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, spoken about a year before His Death, in the synagogue at Capernaum, and prepared for by the miracle in which with five barley loaves and two small fishes He had fed five thousand men, besides women and children.

In this discourse our Blessed Lord speaks several times of the "Bread which came down from Heaven" and which has the property of giving life unto the world; and tells them that this Bread is His Flesh. This He asserts in the most emphatic terms, and repeats it over and over again; and when the hearers, unable to believe it, come and ask "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" our Lord replies with even greater emphasis: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you" (S. John vi. 53). When after this explanation His disciples said, "This is an hard saying; who can hear it?" and "JESUS knew in Himself that His disciples murmured at it," He asked, "Doth this offend you?" adding, "There are some of you that believe not. . . . No man can come unto Me, except it be given him of My FATHER" (S. John vi. 60–65). Moreover, when at the close of His discourse "many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him,"—being unable or unwilling to accept this teaching,—our Lord did not call them back and explain to them that they had mistaken the meaning of His words, but allowed

them to go, turning to the Twelve and asking, "Will ye also go away?"

We see, therefore, not only that our Lord again and again asserted that He would give, by way of food and drink, His Body and Blood, but that He met objections to it, not by explaining the manner, but by re-asserting the truth; and that, loving as He did the souls of men, He allowed those to go away who would not receive it, without making any further effort to explain it to them.

It seems almost impossible to conceive of clearer teaching than this. In our Lord's own words we have (1) the statement in S. Matthew, S. Mark and S. Luke, that He said "This is My Body"; (2) its reiteration by S. Paul some seventeen years later, as having been directly revealed to him by CHRIST; and (3) our Lord's discourse on the subject, so full and clear, in which the objections of His hearers were met by the re-assertion of His teaching.

Protestant objections,

Now against this Protestants bring two objections: (1) that our Lord was speaking *figuratively*, as when He said, "I am the door," and "I am the true vine," and "I am the light of the world"; and (2) that He explained His teaching in regard to feeding on His Flesh and Blood by saying: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (S. John vi. 63).

And their answers. i. They were not figurative.

In regard to the first objection we may remark that the cases are not at all similar. If our Lord had said, "I am this door," or "this vine," or "this light," in each case pointing out some special object, the words would not have been figurative; but even as He spoke these words they were not merely figurative, but lit-

erally true; for He is the Door. "Door" is an equivocal word, signifying either the entrance to a place, or the material construction that closes the entrance. In the first sense He is the Door of Heaven, not only figuratively, but in the sense of being the Way by which we enter Heaven (S. John xiv. 6). So also He is the true Vine, for the very adjective "true" indicates that it was the vine considered ideally of which He spoke, and not any material vine; and He goes on to show that the property which makes Him the "true Vine" is that of union with the branches, the members of His Church, the Source and Stay of whose life He is. And again, He is the "Light of the world" in the true sense that without Him the world is in darkness.

In each case the use of the article also shows exactly what He meant. He did not say, "I am a door," or "a vine," or "light," but "*the* Door," etc., showing that the idea was an abstract and not a concrete one.

But how different are His words in regard to the Blessed Sacrament! "This is My Body." He took into His hands bread, a piece of matter, and said of it, "This is My Body"; and He had promised a year before that the Bread which He would give would be His Flesh.

Then again, the words were spoken under circumstances of exceptional solemnity. It was the last night of His earthly life, and this was His legacy to the Church, the legacy of His Body, to be the Food of all His people. Would a Protestant, to whom some friend had left as a legacy the house in which he lived, be satisfied if the heirs, when they came to administer the estate, sent him a photograph of the house, with the remark that it represented the house, and therefore was what the testator meant? Or, if the heirs did such a thing,

would any court of justice sustain them? Why, then, are these solemn words of our Lord's last Testament emptied of all meaning? The only rational explanation is the unwillingness of some to believe in the supernatural. It is "an hard saying" and they cannot hear it.

ii. They were spiritual, but absolutely true.

To the objection brought by Protestants that when His disciples murmured our Lord explained His words by saying, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life,"—our reply is that this objection is founded upon the same false principle as the other, namely, a disbelief in the supernatural. Protestants evidently think that spiritual things have no reality because they are invisible; whereas nothing can be more real than spiritual things for "the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. iv. 18). The spiritual realities which are behind material things are the only things which we know to be absolutely real and true. So that when our Lord tells us that His words are to be understood in a *spiritual* and not in a carnal sense, we know that this is but an assertion of their absolute, their spiritual truth.

Analogy of CHRIST'S words to the woman of Samaria.

So again, when our Lord said, "GOD is [a] Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth," we have an assertion of the intense sincerity and truth demanded by GOD in all spiritual things. "In spirit and in truth" is contrasted with the low, earthly conceptions and insincere excuses with which the woman of Samaria had attempted to evade our Lord's teaching, and which remind us of the very similar way in which Protestants try to get out of the plain meaning of our Lord's

words concerning the Holy Eucharist. Protestants mean by "spiritual things" something like moonshine; that is, something vague and misty, instead of something absolutely real.

We may observe, too, that the right interpretation of "spiritual" guards against any gross views or material conception of the Blessed Sacrament, such as the Capernaites had,—that it was eating the Flesh and Blood of a *natural* Body, not of a glorified or spiritual Body as our Lord's was after the Resurrection. As S. Paul says, "It is raised a *spiritual* body" (1 Cor. xv. 44).

Gross views guarded against.

But we have more than the plain teachings of our Blessed Lord. We have also the witness of His Church in all ages; for from the time of S. Paul to the present day there is a *catena* of witnesses to the fact of the Real Presence of CHRIST in the Blessed Sacrament. There have been and still are slight differences of opinion in regard to the mode of the Presence, but as regards the *fact*, the teaching of the Church, contradicted only by a few heretics, has been unanimous.

2. The witness of the Church.

In the sixteenth century, when the tares which had been sown among the wheat began to manifest themselves in the form of almost every heresy conceivable to the human mind, men denied the truth of our Lord's words and the teaching of His Church. But even to-day, while Protestants persist in their denial of the truth, they are not agreed in their affirmation of what they do believe. Moreover, they are but a handful compared with the Catholic Church throughout the world, and are separated from that Church not only by schism but by the loss of Apostolic succession; which cuts them off from all valid Sacraments except those of Baptism and Holy Matrimony.

The Church herself of the East as well as of the West, is at one in regard to the *objective* nature of the Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament of the Altar.

II. Four erroneous views.

The *erroneous* views on this subject fall into four classes, all of which violate the analogy of faith involved in the Incarnation and correspond respectively to the ancient heresies of Arius, the Docetæ, Eutyches and Nestorius. We shall be better prepared to state the positive doctrine of the Church after having exposed these errors.

i. Zwinglianism.

1. The Zwinglians held that there is no Presence of CHRIST whatever in the Blessed Sacrament, that is, that there is *no* "inward part"; that the Sacrament is a mere memorial of an absent Lord. This resembles the heresy of Arius, who practically denied our Lord to be anything more than man.

ii. Transubstantiation inaccurately taught.

2. Another error is that which is inaccurately spoken of in the twenty-eighth Article of Religion as "Transubstantiation." This is a false view held by some Romanists which denies any *reality* in the outward sign, asserting "that the bread and wine are so changed, so destroyed, that there absolutely remains nothing of them" (Gaume, "Catechism of Perseverance," vol. ii. p. 435). This error, as our Article observes, "overthrows the nature of a Sacrament"; and more,—it destroys the very Sacramental channel by which the Body and Blood of CHRIST are conveyed to the soul. It is like the heresy of Docetism which denied that our Lord's Body had any reality. We may observe that this error is more strictly called Transelementation, and (as we shall show later on) that it is not the authorized teaching of the Roman Church.

3. A third error is called Consubstantiation, a view which was taught by Luther,—that the substance of the Body and Blood of CHRIST co-exists in union with the substance of bread and wine. This together with Luther's doctrine of the ubiquity of our Lord's Humanity nearly involves Eutychianism, which taught that the Nature of CHRIST was a sort of fusion of the Human and Divine, forming a "*tertium quid*." It should be observed, however, that Lutherans repudiate the term "consubstantiation." Luther also taught that the Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament was transient (being confined to the use of the Eucharist for purposes of Communion), and that the Presence ceased if, for instance, the Sacrament was reserved. This view, which certainly finds no support either in Holy Scripture or the traditions of the Church, is still held by some who follow Luther's teachings.

iii. Consubstantiation and Lutheranism.

4. The fourth error is the Receptionist theory of Calvin and others, who, while denying any *objective* Presence of CHRIST in the Sacrament, taught that there is a subjective Presence in the soul of the faithful receiver after partaking of the Sacrament; thus separating the inward from the outward part of the Sacrament, and making the *Res Sacramenti* depend not upon Consecration, but upon the recipient's faith. This corresponds to Nestorianism, which taught that our Lord had two distinct Persons.

iv. Calvinism or the Receptionist theory.

The whole question is concerned with the two parts of the Sacrament, the outward and the inward, and their relation to one another. Zwinglianism destroys the inward part; Transelementation destroys the outward part; Consubstantiation fuses the two parts together; and Calvinism separates them from one another. If it were not impossible to construct more than four false

The four views summed up.

propositions out of these two terms, doubtless it would have been done!

III. Positive teaching of the Church.

We are now in a position to take up the positive teaching of the Church in regard to the Real Presence, and to consider what is meant when we say that the Body and Blood of CHRIST are present under the forms of bread and wine.

Nature of the Presence.

Concomitance.

We mean that under each kind is present whole CHRIST, His Body and Blood, His Soul and Divinity. For where the Body of CHRIST is, there must be all that pertains to His Humanity, that is Flesh, Bones, Blood and Soul, since without these He would not be living Man; and though once, at His death, His Soul and Blood were separated from His Body, He has been "raised from the dead" and is "alive forevermore."

Hence the Presence of these together with His Body is said to be by virtue of "Concomitance." The same is the case in regard also to His Blood, present under the form of wine. By concomitance the Body and Soul are also present. And since the Sacred Humanity of our Lord has never had any personal existence except as united to His Divinity, therefore where the Humanity of our Lord is, there also must be that Divinity which is hypostatically and indissolubly united to It. From this it follows that our Lord as whole CHRIST is present under either species.

Mode inexplicable.

Not natural or material, but supernatural, spiritual, supra-local,

We must remember, however, that the mode of this Presence is inexplicable. It is beyond the power of human thought fully to comprehend that our Lord is not present naturally or materially, but supernaturally, spiritually; that He is not even present "locally," that is after the order of space, but supra-locally, after a manner which transcends space. He is not present by

way of "extension"; for the whole CHRIST is in every particle of the Consecrated Species. *Locally* our Lord's Body is present only at the Right Hand of GOD the FATHER, as we say in the Creed; and as His Humanity is not ubiquitous, as Luther erroneously taught, It can be in only one place at one time, so far as *space* is concerned. It is present in the Holy Eucharist sacramentally, that is by a mode which, as we have said, entirely transcends space.

and sacramental.

Though following the practice of the early Church and of the Eastern Church up to this day, we receive the Holy Communion in both kinds, yet if for any cause it were impossible or impracticable to receive It except in one kind, a valid Communion would be made and whole CHRIST would be received. In the ancient Church this was often the case in the Communion of the sick with the Reserved Sacrament when it was impossible to carry the Chalice to them; and sometimes, though very rarely, it happens in the case of a dying man who, while unable to swallow sufficiently to receive the Body of our Lord under the species of bread, is able to receive It under the species of wine.

Reception under one kind.

A further question, and one of great importance, is the *nature* of the Body of CHRIST which we receive in the Holy Eucharist. Now, *what* is a human body, even in this world? It is certainly not the chemical atoms which go to make it up,—the particles of carbon and nitrogen and oxygen and other chemical elements which go to form our flesh,—for they come into our body through the food we eat and pass out of it with the waste of tissue caused by combustion; so that probably, with the exception of some particles of bone and tissue, there are not in a man's body any of the material particles which were there twenty

What is man's body?

years ago. *What*, then, is the body? We do not know. It is a force which has the power of borrowing, so to speak, matter from the world around and building it up or organizing it under a certain form, which form appears to be an essential part of the human body, though the matter by which it is manifested certainly is not.

The body of a whirlwind.

Let us take as an illustration a whirlwind. It passes over the desert of the Sahara and takes up the sand. You see the column of sand moving across the desert. The whirlwind at last reaches an oasis; it drops the sand and in its place takes up the leaves and broken branches of the trees and whirls them about. It comes at last to the sea, and dropping the leaves and branches, or the sand, takes up the water and becomes a water-spout. Now *what* is the body of the whirlwind? Not the sand, or the leaves, or the water. These were but various kinds of matter, which it took into itself in its course. Nor is the wind the body, since the wind passes on and other wind, so to speak, or rather air in motion, takes its place and still preserves the form.

Now our material bodies whilst they are on this earth take into themselves matter by way of food and get rid of it by the slow waste of tissue through the process of combustion. But a glorified body apparently has no *necessary* relation to "matter," but perhaps like the whirlwind may take the matter up and drop it at pleasure; just as some at least of the angels who have appeared to men seem to have assumed material forms and put them off at pleasure.

Matter not necessary to a glorified body; but possible.

Example of angels,

With Tobit,

For instance, had the angel who was so long the companion of Tobit been simply immaterial the fact must have been discovered in the journey; for the angel's transparency would have been manifest to

Tobit by the sight of things beyond him, or in touching him he would have discovered that the angel had no material body. And again, to quote from the proto-canonical Scriptures, we have the example of the three angels who actually ate with Abraham at Mamre. (Gen. xviii. 8). And our Blessed Lord after His Resurrection ate before His disciples. (S. Luke xxiv. 41-43).

With Abraham.

Our Lord after His Resurrection.

These thoughts may enable us to grasp a little better the mystery of a glorified body, that is a body which is risen from the dead.

We have one point still to consider—the mode of the Presence; for while we are able to gather from revelation and the teachings of the Church accurate statements regarding the fact and nature of the Presence, revelation is absolutely silent touching *the mode*. When the Jews asked, "How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?" our Lord asserted the necessity of feeding upon His Flesh and Blood but refrained from answering the question concerning the manner. And as we have already said, while the teaching of the Church has been uniform respecting the *fact* of the Presence, there has been no such agreement touching the mode.

IV. Mode of the Presence.

The first authoritative attempt at definition was made by the Council of Trent in the second canon of its thirteenth session, in 1551, in the following words: "If any man shall affirm that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of bread and wine remains together with the Body and Blood of our Lord JESUS CHRIST; and shall deny that wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of wine into the Blood, the species of bread and wine

Tridentine definition.

alone remaining; which conversion, indeed, the Catholic Church has most appropriately called Transubstantiation; let him be anathema."

Substance an equivocal term.

And here we may observe that the definition labours under the defect of using without explanation the equivocal term "substance." For the idea connoted by the term "substance" represents a thing about which we know nothing, not even whether it has any real existence in connection with matter.

A philosophical theory only.

For the idea of substance exists purely as a philosophical theory, to denote an imaginary *substratum* in things, which has been differently understood by different persons at different times. And although it may be said that the definition of the Council of Trent referred to substance as understood in scholastic philosophy, yet even here the objectivity of substance is at least unproved.

Substance as defined by S. Thomas.

S. Thomas defines substance as "being, inasmuch as this being is by itself. Accident is that whose being is to be in something else." And roughly it is said that substance is what exists by itself and does not inhere in another. But we do not know whether outside the realm of thought there is any such thing; and different schools of philosophy have rejected this idea of substance,—the Cartesian, for instance, which in the seventeenth century obtained a strong foothold in the Church, making the Tridentine doctrine of transubstantiation philosophically impossible.

And although the tendency of philosophy in the present day is more in the direction of scholasticism, yet in so important a matter it seems wiser, and perhaps more reverent, not to attempt to define what our Lord, when the difficulty was brought before

Him, did not reveal. We may well be content, with the whole Church up to the sixteenth century, to insist on the objective reality of the Presence, and to state clearly Its substantial nature, but to apply to the mode of the Presence the term "sacramental," or "mysterious."

Transubstantiation accepted by the Eastern Church.

We must not, however, pass from the question of transubstantiation without observing that the Eastern Church, since the Council of Bethlehem in 1672, has accepted the term, or rather its equivalent *μετουσίωσις*; nor without examining the statement of our twenty-eighth Article of Religion: "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

Art. XXVIII.

Does not refer to Tridentine definition.

This statement cannot by any ingenuity be twisted into a condemnation of the Tridentine definition, which is the present doctrine of the Roman Church. For, in the first place the Article was written by Cramner before the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent was held; and, secondly, the Tridentine definition does not overthrow the nature of a Sacrament. There was in the Middle Ages a gross view in regard to the Presence of our Lord, which represented His Body and Blood as being present *physically;* so that, as we read in one of the Homilies of S. Aelfric, a particle of the Host appeared as a finger of our Lord's Body, at the prayer of S. Gregory, for the conversion of an unbelieving woman. This carnal view of the Presence, which seems to have been very prevalent at one time among the ignorant classes, is quite as contrary to the Tridentine doctrine as it is to ours. And while Roman theo-

Capernaite view.

Opinions of Romans as to the accidents.

logians by no means agree in their explanation of the definition of the Council of Trent, especially in regard to the condition of what they call "the accidents" after the substance of bread and wine has been removed and the substance of our Lord's Body and Blood has taken its place,—yet many of them assert emphatically the absolute reality of the species of bread and wine.

Algerus quoted.

Algerus, who is quoted by Franzelin, says in his tract against the followers of Berengarius that the Sacrament is understood by every one as a certain sensible and objective reality, and not a mere [subjective] modification in our senses and in surrounding objects; and after discussing the view that our senses are deceived by some subjective impression produced by Divine operation from the spot where the bread and wine were, he sums up thus: "Therefore, by this hypothesis nothing objective and real remains which can be called a Sacrament, since nothing remains apart from our senses and the modification of surrounding objects. And the composition of the Sacrament, which this view demands, out of two things—first, phenomena [the species], and second, reality [the Body of CHRIST]—is an absolute impossibility, since out of reality and nothing no combination can be made. Therefore the Sacrament is composed of the true Body and Blood of CHRIST and of the true species of bread and wine."

Transubstantiation a metaphysical theory.

This extract is probably sufficient to show that Transubstantiation is a question rather of metaphysical theories of matter than of revealed truth, which may well be left to the schools, although it is hoped that sufficient has been said to remove the idea that Transubstantiation necessarily involves any false doctrine about the Real Presence. *If* "substance" is what scho-

lastics have defined it to be, Transubstantiation seems to be the best way of expressing it; but that "if" involves so large a question that we may be thankful our Church has not adopted the term.

V. Eucharistic Adoration a duty,

A necessary result of our Lord's Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament is the practice of Eucharistic Adoration. Since our Lord JESUS CHRIST Himself is present beneath the forms of bread and wine, He must be adored with internal and external worship of that highest order which is called "latria," and which is due to GOD alone.

From the fact of the Hypostatic Union.

This follows from the fact of the Hypostatic Union; that it is not only the Humanity of CHRIST which is present, but, as we have seen, His Godhead; and, that He is permanently present in the Blessed Sacrament, that is, for so long as the species remain uncorrupt.

Wherever our Lord is, He must be an object of adoration to those who believe in Him and love Him. Angels and Saints around His Throne in Heaven adore Him, and the faithful adore Him present upon His Altar-Throne on earth. To believe in the Real Presence of our Lord and not to adore, or not to show our adoration by outward signs, is *indeed* inconsistent; for it is like intentionally passing our Lord by without any mark of recognition.

For believers to neglect it is inconsistent.

Adoration an expression of love.

Eucharistic Adoration, too, is the special expression of our love. When we love any one on earth, and they are at some great distance, we tell them of our love by our letters,—for this is the best we can do. But if they were near to us, it would be inconceivable that we should still love them and yet not desire to go to them and shew them our love by our speech and actions. It is by this intimate communion of soul with soul between friends that the fire of love is fanned into a

blaze; and still more true is it that by Eucharistic Adoration the love of JESUS increases in us and inflames the soul.

We have a practical illustration of this when we compare the religion of Protestants and Catholics,—the one so cold, the other so full of love. The worship of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament explains the difference.

Reservation for the sick the practice of the early Church.

From the earliest ages of the Church the Blessed Sacrament has been reserved for the Communion of the sick. At first this was doubtless the one purpose of Reservation; but as wherever our Lord is present, He not only may but must be adored, the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament has become to the devout soul an opportunity of Eucharistic Adoration, a practice which has resulted in some of the sweetest experiences of the spiritual life.

The American Pastoral of 1895.

The Pastoral Letter of the American House of Bishops in 1895, by recognizing under certain circumstances, Reservation for the sick, marked an important step towards the authoritative restoration to the Anglican Communion of the inestimable blessing of which until the past half century it has been practically deprived for so many years.

Rubric examined.

It may be well here to notice (in connection with the twenty-eighth Article of Religion), the rubric at the end of the Communion Office, which in the American Prayer-Book is as follows: "And if any of the consecrated Bread and Wine remain after the Communion, it shall not be carried out of the Church; but the Minister and other Communicants shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." The wording of the rubric in the English Prayer-Book is slightly different, but its import is the same.

Now it is quite certain (1) that this rubric was not intended to refer in any way to the question of Reservation, but to a very different matter,—the reverent consumption of what was not needed for purposes of Communion; and (2) it is also equally clear that as expressed in the *American* Prayer-Book it does not forbid Reservation.

1. Does not refer to Reservation.

The rubric in the English Book was introduced in the year 1662, and is from the pen of Bishop Cosin. We have in Cosin's own handwriting a document entitled "Suggested Corrections in the Prayer-Book," which formed the basis of the alterations made at the Savoy Conference. In this we read: "It is likewise here ordered [in the Book of 1604], that if any of the bread and wine remain, the Curate shall have it to his own use; which words some Curates have abused and extended so far, that they suppose they may take all that remains of the *consecrated* Bread and Wine Itself home to their houses, and there eat and drink the same with their other common meats. . . . Some words are needful here to be added . . . if any of the *consecrated* elements be left, that he and others with him shall decently eat and drink them in the Church, before all the people depart from it." (Cosin's Works, Vol. v. p. 519, sec. 65).

This rubric, then, was put in by the Catholic party after their victory over the Puritans at the Savoy Conference, to prevent a specific practice which then prevailed. This is not a matter of opinion, but of history. We have in Cosin's handwriting the above statement; and it is preposterous to say that the rubric refers to the twenty-eighth Article, which had been drawn up for more than a hundred years, during which period Reservation for the purpose of adoration was not the

practice of the English Communion. Rubrics and laws are not enacted against practices which have passed away a century before. The purpose of the rubric, therefore, was only to explain and limit the words in the Prayer-Book of 1604: "If any of the bread and wine remain, the Curate shall have it to his own use;" and to prevent the irreverence of not consuming the Sacred Species; and it had nothing whatever to do with the twenty-eighth Article.

2. Does not forbid it.

The rubric in the American Prayer-Book does not forbid the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the sick, for it inferentially divides all the consecrated elements into two classes,—that which is used for Communion, and that which is not (*i. e.*, what remains after the Communion); and it directs that what is in the second class "the Minister and other Communicants shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink." But what is reserved for the Communion of the sick does not belong to the second class at all, but to the first, to that which is used for Communion. It is just as much used for Communion if it be carried to a sick person a quarter of a mile away from the Church, as if it be carried to a person kneeling at the altar rails,—the only difference being one of time and distance. It is therefore in an entirely different class from "what remains," which is directed to be consumed since it is not needed for the purposes of Communion.

While the English rubric is not worded quite so clearly as that in the American Book, its import, as we have said, is the same.

Article XXVIII.

It would be sufficient to point out in regard to the twenty-eighth Article, that while it states that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by CHRIST'S

ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped," which is true so far as the record in Holy Scripture goes, yet it does not say that such practices are in themselves objectionable. Indeed, if the Blessed Sacrament is not to be lifted up or carried about it would be quite impossible to communicate the people. If we are limited in regard to the Sacraments by what is *explicitly* enjoined by CHRIST in the Gospels, we might doubt whether women were to be communicated. For there is no direct mention of any being present at the Institution, although, of course, this is not the Church's tradition. Again, if we take Confirmation, we find no directions about it in the Gospels. So that the mere fact that it was not part of CHRIST'S ordinance does not imply any condemnation of a practice which the whole Church has followed in all ages.

Conclusion.

We must, however, remember in regard to Eucharistic Adoration in connection with the Reserved Sacrament, that the blessing is not in any sense the same as that of *offering* the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which offering is accomplished by the act of Consecration alone, whereas the blessing of being before the Reserved Sacrament is that of nearness to our Lord in His Sacramental Presence.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.—THE SACRIFICE.

Introductory.

THE Holy Eucharist, the central act of Christian worship, by which GOD is most glorified and man most blessed, is a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead.

History of the idea of sacrifice.

In the chapter on the Atonement we discussed at some length the idea of sacrifice, showing that it was originally the expression of love, and that after sin had severed the filial relation which existed between GOD and man, sacrifice became the confession of a sense of alienation, as well as the expression of a longing for reconciliation, and also a witness to a conviction of guilt and to the justice of the punishment of sin.

Among the heathen.

The fact that these ideas everywhere seem to be bound up with the term "sacrifice" points to some primeval revelation from GOD to our first parents, which, though sometimes distorted in the handing down from generation to generation, preserved always through GOD'S Providence the same essential features.

Among the Jews.

As years rolled on GOD chose for Himself "a peculiar people," in order that through them man might be prepared to receive that revelation through JESUS CHRIST by which he was both brought back to God and enabled to know and worship Him acceptably.

Sacrificial idea developed

In training the Jewish nation for this purpose the central idea developed was the idea of sacrifice. What all the nations of the world had witnessed to imperfectly, the Jews, by their law, ritual, type and prophecy, were to teach distinctly. Though they themselves did not realize the fact, we, as we look back upon their history and read the books of the Old Testament, see that it was in reality a revelation of the Sacrifice of our Lord JESUS CHRIST on the Cross, and Its perpetuation in the Holy Eucharist.

by law, ritual, type and prophecy.

Our Lord's sacrificial work in its details prefigured.

And not only did the whole of their religious system point in a general way to the Sacrifice of CHRIST, but on examination we find almost every detail of that Sacrifice and Its effects typified and foreshadowed in the worship of the Jewish Church. In a ray of light the presence and beauty of the colours of which it is composed can neither be detected nor appreciated, unless by the use of a prism it is analyzed and its component parts separated. We are enabled then to see hidden treasures of colour whose existence was unrecognized because they were all so perfectly blended in one ray of pure white light. So in the Cross of CHRIST the work of redemption presents itself to us as one great whole, but the unfathomable depth of Divine Love and the unsearchable riches of Divine Grace are revealed to us as we study in the types of the Old Testament the various aspects and details of our Blessed Lord's work which are gathered up into the blaze of light which streams from the Cross of Calvary.

All sacrifices of the old world point onward to the Cross.

All the sacrifices of the old world find their climax and fulfilment in the Sacrifice of the Cross, in which what they strove partially to express is plainly declared, and what was distorted and untrue is set right. And, from the Cross of CHRIST shines forth like a glorious

The Eucharistic Sacrifice perpetuates the Cross.

stream of light that pure Sacrifice foretold by Malachi, which CHRIST "did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue" a "perpetual memory of that His precious Death and Sacrifice, until His coming again." As one sometimes sees the moisture caused by evaporation drawn up by the sun in converging rays, and knows that it will be discharged again in gentle showers, refreshing and fertilizing the thirsty earth; so all the crude ideas of sacrifice converge in the one "full, perfect and sufficient Sacrifice" of CHRIST upon the Cross, and then descend again, as it were, through the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, to refresh and fructify every thirsty soul of man that comes to Him.

We are now in a position to define the term "sacrifice."

I. Definition of sacrifice.

Sacrifice is an act of exterior worship, the highest expression of interior devotion, and has been defined by Dr. Paul Schanz as "The presentation to GOD of a visible gift at the hands of a legitimate minister, through its transformation, for the purpose of recognizing the Divine Majesty, and as a means of propitiation and of union with GOD."*

Immaterial offerings not properly sacrifices.

Some people speak of acts of virtue, works of mercy, etc., as sacrifices; but this is a figurative and entirely inadequate use of the word, since, though all sacrifices are offerings, all offerings are not sacrifices. Others speak of thanksgiving and praise as the Christian

* Schanz, *Die Lehre von den Heiligen Sacramenten der Katholischen Kirche*, p. 479. Dr. Schanz does not include as an essential part of his conception of sacrifice the destruction of the victim, but takes *immutatio* in a wider sense, and lays special stress upon the purpose of union with GOD.

sacrifice, quoting the words of our Liturgy, "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" but we must remember that this comes immediately after the Consecration, and refers to the offering of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, which has for its first two ends praise and thanksgiving.

Since the sixteenth century the *immutatio* has been taken by the majority of Roman theologians as implying "the destruction of the Victim," and they have laboured to show the fulfilment of this in the Sacrifice in the Mass.

Destruction of the victim not essential to sacrifice.

The insuperable difficulty in this theory is, however, that if the change effected by the consecration in the bread and wine be held to satisfy this condition it can be shown that the bread and wine is not the Victim offered in the Eucharist; if, on the other hand, the Body and Blood of CHRIST, that *they* are now *impassible*. A more moderate school avoids this difficulty by requiring in the Mass only a mystical immolation.

We shall now see that the Holy Eucharist adequately fulfils the requirements of the definition.

II. The Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The idea of sacrifice seems necessarily to connote three correlative terms,—Priest, Victim and Altar. In the Holy Eucharist we have the *Priest*, our Lord JESUS CHRIST, offering mediately through His representative, the priest who celebrates. We have the *Victim*, JESUS CHRIST Himself, present under the forms of bread and wine; His Body and Blood exhibited, by virtue of the Consecration, as separated by death. It is to exhibit Him as Victim that the Body and Blood are present under different species. And, as the Epistle to the Hebrews says, "we have an *Altar*."

1. In what it consists.

If we now compare the Eucharistic Sacrifice with the definition we shall find that it fulfils all its condi-

The Eucharistic Sacrifice compared with the definition.

tions. The definition was as follows: "Sacrifice is an act of exterior worship, the highest expression of interior devotion;" it has been defined by Dr. Paul Schanz as "The presentation to GOD of a visible gift at the hands of a legitimate minister, through its transformation, for the purpose of recognizing the Divine Majesty, and as a means of propitiation and of union with GOD."

The Holy Eucharist is an act of exterior worship, the highest expression of man's interior devotion. It is an offering to GOD of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which are real and visible Things, though in Their glorified state imperceptible to our senses in their present condition. And though there is no physical immolation of the Victim (since death hath no more dominion over Him), yet we find its mystical equivalent in the separation of the Body and Blood under the different species, by which we "show the Lord's *Death* till He come." (1 Cor. xi. 26).

Four sacrificial actions in the Eucharist.

Four sacrificial actions may be found in the Holy Eucharist:

(1) The Consecration of the two species.

(2) The Oblation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which immediately follows.

(3) The breaking of the Consecrated Host, a small portion of which is by very ancient custom placed in the Precious Blood.

(4) The Communion of the priest.

The essential act in the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

These are all integral parts, and the omission of any one maims the rite, but the first only seems to be *essential* to the *Sacrifice*.

Other Views.

There is, however, some difference of opinion among theologians in regard to what constitutes the essence of the Sacrificial act. The majority consider that it is

constituted by the double Consecration, since by virtue of this the Body and Blood of CHRIST are exhibited under the different species, separated as by death. There is also a view, held by De Lugo, Franzelin and many others, that the essence of the Sacrifice consists in our Lord exhibiting Himself shorn of visible Humanity and reduced to a state in which He can be united to His people as food and drink. Some, again, place the essence in the Communion of the priest; but this is most improbable, since, while it belongs to the proper consummation of the Sacrificial rite, its omission can not be held to invalidate the Sacrifice itself.

Two explanations.

Before we pass from the consideration of the Eucharist as fulfilling the conditions of a Sacrifice, we must carefully notice two things: (1) that the Eucharist is not a Sacrifice of Redemption and Satisfaction, but of the *application* of the Redemption and Satisfaction *to individual needs;* (2) that although we speak of the separation of our Lord's Body and Blood under the two species as setting forth His Death, yet we must never forget that it is not the dead Body of CHRIST that is present in the Holy Eucharist, but His living and glorified Body.

It is true that some few persons of no theological knowledge have taught that it is the dead Body of CHRIST which is received in the Eucharist, but their teaching contradicts Scripture, which tells us that "CHRIST being raised from the dead dieth no more." (Rom. vi. 9, comp. Rev. i. 18).

Such teaching also involves a manifest impossibility, since it demands two different Bodies of CHRIST existent at the same time,—a living and glorified Body in Heaven, and a dead Body on earth; which is absolutely

absurd, since no person can have two bodies,—for the Resurrection body is the same body as that which lived on this earth, only changed into a glorified and spiritual body.

2. The Eucharistic Sacrifice in relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Our Lord finished His Work of Redemption upon the Cross. In the Canon of Consecration this is most clearly asserted: "Thou, of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thine only SON JESUS CHRIST to suffer death upon the Cross for our Redemption; Who made there (by His one Oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

Eucharistic Sacrifice not a repetition of Calvary.

Here we may observe that the Oblation is one, and that it is perfect and sufficient—that is, needs no addition. But while there can be no *repetition* of this one perfect Oblation as offered on Calvary, yet It is of perpetual efficacy. For we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Chap. x. 12) that CHRIST sat down at the right hand of GOD "after He had offered one Sacrifice for sins [to last] *for ever:*" where the force of εἰς τὸ διηνεκές is "continuous," "perpetual," and points to the *perpetual efficacy* of the one all-sufficient Sacrifice of CHRIST.

The Canon of Consecration, after stating this important doctrine of the finished work of Redemption, goes on to say that CHRIST "did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious Death and Sacrifice, until His coming again." The reference here of course is to the Gospel record of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist by our Lord when He gave them the command, "Do this in remembrance of Me." The word "memory" refers to the Greek εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, where ἀνάμνησις means not only a subjective recollection,

but an objective memorial — "the memorial which CHRIST hath commanded us to make."

Now *what* were they to do in order to fulfil CHRIST'S command? They were to offer that Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist by which, as S. Paul says, we "do *show the Lord's Death* till He come."

But mystically identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross.

The Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist is altogether the same in Its *nature* as that which our Lord offered upon the Cross. For the same Lamb of GOD is offered Who on the Cross offered Himself to take away the sins of the world,—the same Body which was born of Mary and crucified on Calvary, the same precious Blood which was there shed; and there is the same Priest (though now acting mediately), and the same Victim. So that we may say that the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist is not a repetition of that of the Cross, but is identical with it.

The identity is found in the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

It has its differences, but they belong not so much to the essence of the Sacrifice as to the *mode* in which it is offered. On the Cross our Lord offered visibly to GOD His Body and His Precious Blood.

Differences in mode between the two.

In the Eucharist He offers under the forms of bread and wine that Body which is no longer visible to our earthly eyes (because it possesses the qualities of a Resurrection body, that is, has been glorified), but which will be visible to us when we, like Him, have risen from the dead.

The Presence visible and mystical.

On the Cross He Himself "immediately" as High Priest consummated a Sacrifice of expiation; in the Eucharist He is still the Priest, but mediately, through the priests of the Church.

The Priest immediate and mediate.

On the Cross there was an actual immolation of the Lamb; it was a bloody Sacrifice. In the Eucharist there is a mystical immolation; It is an unbloody Sac-

The Sacrifice bloody and unbloody.

rifice. For by the operation of the HOLY GHOST the bread and wine are converted into the Body and Blood of CHRIST; but in this there is no bloodshed, or pain, or death.

General and individual.

On the Cross the Sacrifice for the redemption of the human race was finished, and satisfaction made to Divine Justice for the sins of the whole world. In the Eucharist the Sacrifice is limited to the Church and is efficaciously applied to her members individually.

The human race and the Church.

Finally, on the Cross the Sacrifice was offered for the whole human race, once for all, while in the Eucharist, on countless altars, in every clime, the Sacrifice has from Pentecost been offered, is now being offered, and shall continue to be offered, for quick and dead, until the Second Coming of our Blessed Lord.

So that, while recognizing the differences between the Sacrifice of the Cross and that of the Altar, we must remember that they are identical, and are not to be thought of as in any real sense separate Sacrifices.

The Sacrifice of the Cross contained the merits of all Eucharists.

For the Sacrifice of the Cross contained in Itself among the fruits of the Passion every celebration of the Divine Mysteries which should be offered in the Church on earth. It is for this reason that S. Paul says that as often as we celebrate the Holy Eucharist we "do show the Lord's Death till He come." The Sacrifice of the

The Eucharist a relative sacrifice.

Altar therefore is not an absolute Sacrifice, but relative to that made upon the Cross, and commemorative of it.

3. Its relation to our Lord's Mediation.

"Sacrifice" is an equivocal word; as it is used both of the act of the Priest in sacrificing, and (passively) of the Victim Who has been offered. In the first sense, of course, there can be no Sacrifice offered in Heaven, since our Lord is there reigning, and resting from His finished work. But in the *passive* sense the Oblation

still abides in Heaven ; for S. John tells us (Rev. v. 6) that he saw in the midst of the Throne "a Lamb as It had been slain" (ὡς ἐσφαγμένον); where the use of the perfect participle implies and indeed requires, that the act of slaying once for all accomplished on Calvary should be understood to be *continuous in its effects*. We have a similar use of the perfect participle in Rev. iv. 1, "I looked, and, behold, a door *was opened* in Heaven" (ἠνεῳγμένη), which implies that the door had been opened by our Lord's Ascension into Heaven, and remained still open.

The Oblation in Heaven.

In the Jewish ritual on the day of Atonement the High Priest alone entered into the Holy of Holies, and so at the Ascension our Lord alone has entered within the Veil ; for in His High Priesthood we have no share, but on earth His priests are to offer What He offered, as Priest, *without* the Veil.

The peculiarity of the sacrifice of the day of Atonement.

The passive pleading of the Sacrifice in Heaven is our Lord's *mediatorial* work, His great Intercession. Some theologians, especially those of modern times, connect the Sacrifice of the Eucharist with this ; but we must remember, that this is not what is meant by "the Sacrifice of the Eucharist." For the Sacrifice of the Eucharist on earth is an *act*, while the Oblation of the Sacrifice of Christ in Heaven is a *state*, as is shown by the words in which S. John describes it.

III. In what way It is offered by the faithful.

Strictly speaking, in the Holy Eucharist it is the priest alone who properly offers the Sacrifice, since the act of Sacrifice is certainly *completed* by his Communion. The faithful who are present at the Celebration assist in this offering only by uniting their intention with that of the priest ; so that there is no essential reason why they should make their Communion at every Celebration.

They assist in the offering of the priest.

1. Three fruits of the Sacrifice.

We generally distinguish a threefold fruit in the Eucharist Sacrifice in its relation to different classes of people.

i. The general fruit.

The general fruit is that which results from the Sacrifice so far as It is offered by the priest acting for the whole Church. All members of the Church who are living in communion with her participate in this fruit; and it is one of the penalties of being excommunicate by sin that all this fruit is lost to those cut off from her Communion, that is, they have no share in all the countless Eucharists which are everywhere offered for the Church. A *greater* share in the general fruit of the Sacrifice belongs to those who are brought to a closer relation with the particular Eucharist which is offered, by being present at It. This fruit, being by way of impetration, depends upon the merit and devotion of each participant.

ii. The special fruit.

The special fruit is gained by the person or persons for whom the Sacrifice is offered, according to the intention of the priest.

iii. The most special fruit.

The most special fruit belongs to the priest as a private person doing the good work of offering the Sacrifice. It is greater or less according to the merit and devotion of him who celebrates, and it is for this reason among others that for a priest to be present and make his Communion when another is celebrating is not the same thing as for him to celebrate himself. If he desires to perform this essentially priestly act and to obtain this most blessed fruit, he himself must be the celebrant.

2. The four ends of sacrifice.

The principal purposes for which the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is offered are four: (1) Praise, (2) Thanksgiving, (3) Propitiation, (4) Impetration.

i. Praise.

It is a Sacrifice of Praise, that is, it is the chief and

essential act of Christian worship by which GOD is most glorified. The Services of Matins and Evensong and the Breviary Offices gain their value as acts of worship from being, so to speak, echoes or memorials of the Eucharist. From the unique character of the Holy Eucharist follows especially the obligation of being present at the offering of the Holy Sacrifice on every Sunday and day of obligation, since without it the worship of Sunday is incomplete and "our bounden duty and service" not rendered.

ii. Thanksgiving.

It is a sacrifice of Thanksgiving. As we have already noticed, in the Prayer of Consecration we beseech GOD "to accept this our Sacrifice of *praise* and *thanksgiving*." The very word "Eucharist" signifies "Thanksgiving," and the Blessed Sacrament is spoken of by S. Paul under this title. (1 Tim. ii. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 16).

Neglect of thanksgiving the great obstacle to spiritual progress.

It has been said that the great obstacle to progress in the spiritual life is not temptation, since that, if rightly met, is a means of development and growth; but want of thankfulness, since it is a law of GOD in His dealings with creatures that for His benefits a return must be made. The seas receive the rivers and return the clouds. The thirsty earth receives the rain, and in gratitude returns its various fruits. Man alone takes all he can get, grumbles if he thinks he has not obtained enough, and seldom remembers to thank GOD; still more rarely to thank Him in the way appointed by our Lord and prescribed by His Church.

What a new light to many this throws on the Eucharist, that it is the means by which they can thank GOD acceptably for His blessings to them! Every Sunday as we offer the Holy Sacrifice let us remember

that it is not only our service of praise but that it is also our act of thanksgiving for all His goodness to us.

The ingratitude of coming only to communicate.

To come to the Blessed Sacrament only when we need to make our Communion is the very essence of selfishness and ingratitude. What should we think of some friend who never came to see us for the pleasure of our company, but only when he wanted to ask some favour of us, to get something out of us. Yet this is the way in which we treat our Blessed Lord, Who in His tender love is present in the Holy Eucharist.

iii. Propitiation.

It is a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead, that is, it is offered in expiation and satisfaction for the sins of those in GOD'S Church on earth and in Purgatory. The propitiatory character of the Eucharist does not so much imply that the offering of the Eucharist will take away the *guilt* of sin (for that requires penitence and usually the use of the Sacrament of Penance) as it enables us to pay the temporal debt of sin which remains after penitence, and of which we have spoken in Chapter xiii. under the head of Satisfaction.

This payment of the temporal debt due to sin as S. Augustine says, can be effected by the prayers of Holy Church, by alms-deeds, but especially by the life-giving Sacrifice. And, in a secondary sense, it avails for the remission of sins, as we have seen in Chapter xiv. And since it is propitiatory for quick and dead, it is applied in this way to the needs of ourselves, of our friends, and of the Holy Souls in Purgatory.

iv. Impetration.

It is a Sacrifice of Impetration, that is, of prayer. By this we are to understand that the offering of the Holy Eucharist has the effect of prayer, or rather, of the most prevailing prayer. It is on this account that we offer it with special intention, by which we mean that we use the Sacrifice to plead for us in the same

manner as our prayers do, though in a far higher degree.

IV. Some general considerations.

There still remain to be noticed some few points, which may be grouped under a general head.

The merits of the two Sacrifices not the same.

The merit of our Lord's Sacrifice upon the Cross is infinite, while that of the Sacrifice of the Altar, looked at from its *human* side, as the result of an act of will on the part of a human priest, is, like all human acts, finite; and hence many Celebrations are of more avail than one, which, of course, would not be the case if the merits of each were infinite.

The grace works "ex opere operato."

While the grace of the Eucharist works *ex opere operato*, and therefore is not hindered by the unworthiness of the priest who celebrates, yet it is also true that, (viewed again from the human side,) it gains value from the holiness of the celebrant, so that the Sacrifices of a saintly priest may obtain what those of a priest in sin could not.

But in impetration also "ex opere operantis."

This does not mean that a person communicating at the hands of a sinful priest loses any grace; but that in the offering of the Sacrifice the intention of a holy priest may avail more than that of another. This refers only to the fourth end of Sacrifice, impetration. Here, since the Sacrifice is looked upon as a prayer, it must depend, like all prayers, upon the earnestness and sanctity of him who makes it, and therefore it works *ex opere operantis*. Hence the need of a sincere offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies."

Cases of interrupted Masses.

From what we have said of the essence of the Sacrifice, that it is effected by the double Consecration, it would follow that if a priest were to consecrate in one kind, under the species of bread, and were to die before he could consecrate under the species of wine, our Lord would be present under the form of bread, but there

would be no Sacrifice, since His Death would not be shown forth. And again, although it is not of the *essence* of a valid Sacrifice that the priest should make his Communion, yet his Communion belongs to the *perfection* of the Sacrificial act, for it is held that should the celebrant be taken so ill as to be unable to go on with the Service, or should die after the Consecration and before making his Communion,—another priest, if he can be obtained, must go on with the Liturgy, and, even though not fasting, make his Communion, so as to complete the Sacrifice.

Private Masses.

Private Masses are defined by some to be Low Masses as opposed to the Solemn or Public Mass, by others to be Masses at which the priest alone communicates. In private Masses the priest must have at least a server to represent the body of the faithful.

Solitary Masses forbidden.

Solitary Masses where no one but the priest is present are strictly forbidden. They were *prohibited* first in the ninth century by the Council of Mayence (A.D. 813) canon 43, and by the Synod of Paris (A.D. 829) canon 48.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.—THE COMMUNION.

Introductory.

WE are in all things the effect, of which GOD is the unceasing Cause; for GOD not only brought us into being by an act of creation, but preserves us in being by a distinct exercise of His Divine power; and if GOD were to cease to act upon us as the Cause of our being, we should at once cease to exist. The Divine action by which our life is preserved is called conservation.

GOD'S gift and conservation of life.

In the work of conservation GOD uses means.

While GOD is the First, or Efficient Cause of our existence, He often uses creatures as means to carry out His will in this work of conservation, so that while in every part of our nature we are effects, of which GOD is the Cause, the link between the effect and Cause is generally some creature which we use by way of food, that is to say, something from without taken into ourselves and assimilated by us.

The law of food

in the preservation of physical life,

For instance, the life of the body is the gift of GOD, but it is conditioned by the law that we must eat in order to preserve the gift; and food is a creature taken from without into ourselves and assimilated by us through the processes of digestion.

of mental life,

Again, the life of the mind is the gift of GOD, and yet this also depends upon food for its development, that is, on the study of creatures outside ourselves,

which are taken, as it were, into our intellectual system and digested by the processes of thought and study.

of spiritual life.

And the same is true of that gift of Divine life which was implanted in us in Baptism. In order that it may be preserved and developed it must be fed, and the means by which it is fed is the Holy Communion. As without food the body wastes and dies, and without study the mind is dwarfed and stunted and remains undeveloped, so without the Holy Eucharist the life of grace in the soul cannot grow, and is even in danger of extinction.

The Holy Eucharist the key to many mysteries.

Theologians have seen in the Eucharist, which is the great extension of the Incarnation, a climax of all GOD'S work for man and a key to the mysteries of human life. The laws and customs of society of all ages conspire together to point to the Holy Eucharist as their final Cause, and in it we may find a summary of GOD'S loving purposes for man.

Its relation to the lower creation through the law of food.

But the Eucharist passes through and beyond man, and extends to all creatures; for all creatures tend to perfect themselves, that is, to pass from a lower to a more perfect state; and in doing this they lose their own mode of existence as they are taken up into a higher life.

We may begin even with inorganic matter, such as air, water and earth, which by becoming the food of organic bodies lose their own proper mode of existence and pass into the higher mode of life of the body to which they have become assimilated. Thus the vegetable feeds upon air and water and earth, from which it draws the constituents of its material structure. The animal feeds upon the vegetable, and in doing so takes it up into its own higher form of organization.

Man feeds upon both vegetable and animal, and so takes into his body, which is the flower and crown of all the lower creation, the representatives of all its kingdoms,—mineral, vegetable and animal. But at each stage the lower creature surrenders its own mode of existence, and has, as it were, communicated to it the higher life of the organism into which it is taken up.

This law does not stop at man.

The process, however, does not stop at man ; for as each kingdom of nature has, so to speak, stooped down into a lower kingdom and lifted it up into itself, so is it even with GOD in His infinite condescension and love. For in the Incarnation GOD stooped to take man into Himself, and in the Holy Communion that act of His Divine love is perpetuated.

In the Holy Communion no real reversal of this law.

At each stage the means employed is food, the lower becoming the food of the higher, and sharing thus in its life, until man is at last reached. Then the process seems to be reversed, and the Higher becomes the food of the lower, in order that man, through eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of Him Who came down from Heaven, may have eternal life. The reversal of the process, however, is only *apparent* since we do not by feeding upon CHRIST take Him into ourselves as we assimilate food to ourselves. The opposite is the case ; He takes us into Himself, taking up from our nature all that can be sanctified by grace, and raising it into the higher sphere of His own Divine life.

The Eucharist is to the moral world what the sun is to the material, its centre.

Thus the Eucharist is to the moral world what the sun is to the material. As, according to some theories, all the solar system was once a part of the sun, so that it owes its origin to the sun round which it circles, gravitating towards it, as well as receiving from it the light and heat necessary for its life ; so everything

created by Him Who imparts Himself to us under the forms of bread and wine, gravitates, as it were, towards the Holy Eucharist, by means of which it is taken up again into the Divine life. Thus the whole creation flows incessantly from the Bosom of the Creator, and incessantly returns thither again.

I. The chief effects of Communion. 1. Special.

The four effects which we enumerated in Chapter xiv. were :

(1) Perfection and conservation of the supernatural life of the soul through union with Christ ;

(2) The closer cementing of our union with CHRIST and with all the members of His Mystical Body ;

(3) Remission in certain circumstances of sin, and cleansing of the soul ;

(4) The restoration of a certain "integrity" of the body, by which it is prepared for a glorious resurrection and for the immortality of the life to come.

2. General. It acts upon i. the affections. ii. the intellect. iii. the will.

Without considering these again in detail, we may observe that the Eucharist affects every part of our nature. Not only does it kindle our affections with Divine charity, but it acts upon the two sovereign powers of the soul, illuminating the intellect and giving strength to the will.

iv. It affects also the body.

Moreover, as we have noticed, the feeding upon the Body and Blood of CHRIST has at least a mediate effect upon our bodies through their intimate union with CHRIST'S Body, which *to some extent* restores to us that original "integrity" by which our nature was kept in true equilibrium. For it diminishes and tempers the strength of concupiscence, or desire, and so enables the intellect and will to maintain their supremacy over the lower nature. S. Ignatius the Martyr speaks of the Holy Communion as "the Medicine of immortality," and S. Cyril says that it is in some mys-

terious way the seed of the future glorious resurrection of the body by which it passes to its immortal life in Heaven.

Effects peculiar to each species.

Before passing from the effects of Communion we may remark that while it is true that either species nourishes us by increasing habitual grace, yet there are certain secondary effects attributed to each of the consecrated species separately. The species of Bread conveys especially the gift of strength, as we read in Holy Scripture, "Bread to strengthen man's heart." To the Chalice is attached the gift of gladness,—"Wine that maketh glad the heart of man" (Ps. civ. 15), or, as we pray in the Anima Christi, "Blood of CHRIST, inebriate me!"

II. The twelve fruits of Communion according to S. Thomas.

S. Thomas in his treatise on the Blessed Sacrament traces twelve mystical effects in the soul, which he calls the fruits of Holy Communion. We may connect them with the "Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of GOD," and "which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the Tree were for the healing of the nations" (Rev. ii. 7; xxii. 2). This tree undoubtedly, like the Tree of Life in the midst of the Garden of Eden, points to the Holy Communion.

S. Thomas divides the twelve fruits into three classes, and sees in each a remedy against some ill to which man is subject here.

1. First four fruits.

The first four fruits of Holy Communion are: that it (i.) drives away the devil; (ii.) cools the heat of desire; (iii.) cleanses the stain of the heart; and (iv.) appeases the anger of GOD.

i. It drives away the devil.

What can better drive away our great spiritual foe, and enable us to overcome his temptations, than the Presence of Him Who met and conquered the Evil

one again and again during His life, and won the final victory over him on Calvary? So one fruit of our Communions will be grace to meet our own special temptations.

ii. It cools the heat of desire.

But not only does it enable us to conquer temptations which assail us from without; it also assuages the passions of our own sinful nature, giving us peace within.

iii. It cleanses the stain of the heart.

While the Holy Communion does not remit the guilt of mortal sin, because it does not bestow "the first grace," yet to those who have been cleansed from guilt it answers David's prayer: Wash me more and more from my iniquity: and cleanse me from my sin. For this was the Psalm which he wrote, the prayer which he prayed after Nathan had assured him of GOD'S pardon.

iv. It appeases the anger of GOD.

It appeases the anger of GOD, in so far as by a beneficial reception we are enabled to offer, in union with our LORD, "ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice."

2. Second four fruits.

In the second class we have four fruits of the Body of JESUS, which perfect in us the life of grace: (i.) the illumination of the understanding, that we may know ourselves; (ii.) the kindling of the affections, that we may love GOD; (iii.) the remedy against lack of perseverance by filling the memory with spiritual sweetness; and (iv.) the strengthening of the whole man in all that is good.

Each of these fruits enables us to meet a danger in our spiritual life.

i Illumination of the intellect.

There is first the want of self-knowledge, which leads us to such grievous mistakes about ourselves, and is the chief source of pride, the great foe to humility. The light which comes to us by our union with

CHRIST shows us ourselves as we are; shows us that we have nothing good but what God has given us, nothing of our own except the sin which we have wilfully chosen. This illumination helps us to true humility.

ii. Kindling of the affections.

Next to the want of knowledge of self, we find as we look into our spiritual life, a want of love for GOD and for our neighbour. The things of the world, things which are often intrinsically evil, claim our attention; yet the love of GOD, Who is altogether good, is very weak in us, and the love of our neighbour for GOD'S sake and from no selfish motive, far too seldom really influences our life!

iii. Remedy against lack of perseverance.

Our third danger is in some senses the worst; it is want of perseverance in spiritual exercises, and it often threatens us with the loss of that grace of "final perseverance" without which all we do *now* is useless. Where can we find a remedy like frequent Communion, the sacred Body of JESUS, containing in Itself all sweetness, and making our spiritual exercises a continual delight? "O how sweet are Thy words unto my throat: yea, sweeter than honey unto my mouth!" says the Psalmist (Ps. cxix. 103); and as long as the sweetness of our Communions fills us with a delight in prayer and other devotions, how easy it is to persevere!

iv. Strength for our work.

Our fourth danger is closely akin to the last. That was want of perseverance from loss of delight in spiritual exercises, while this is the danger of sinking under our burden from lack of strength to bear it. In the Blessed Sacrament it is "the Lion of the tribe of Judah" Who comes to us, out of Whose Body (in the Holy Eucharist) comes that honey which at once delights by its sweetness and strengthens by its power;

so that those who feed upon it, like Samson can do mighty works. For of the Blessed Sacrament is the exposition of the riddle most true, "What is sweeter than honey? and what is stronger than a lion?" (Judges xiv. 18). And they who know its power can say with S. Paul, "I can do all things through CHRIST Which strengtheneth me" (Phil. iv. 13).

3. The last four fruits.

In the fruits of the third and last class S. Thomas places (i.) freedom from eternal death; (ii.) increase of merit; (iii.) consolation and guidance in our exile; and (iv.) the resurrection of the body.

These are especially the remedies against the miseries of this mortal life.

i. Freedom from eternal death.

Our first misery is the knowledge of the penalty of everlasting death hanging over us as the result of sin. Our Lord tells us that the fathers in the wilderness ate the Manna (which was a type of the Blessed Sacrament), and died, but that His Body "is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die." For He says, "Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (S. John vi. 50 and 54).

ii. Increase of merit.

The second misery of this life is its waste. We waste our time, and waste our grace, and so waste the lives which GOD has given to us that we may work for Him. We do not correspond to His grace and by so doing add to our merits; but our Lord gives Himself for the life of the world to increase our strength and so to enable us to do good works. As a child by the use of bodily food grows in size and strength and beauty, so the soul that worthily feeds on JESUS in frequent Communion grows in merits and in a holy life.

Our third sorrow in this life is that it is a life of exile. Banished from our true home, and dwelling in this world of sin, we may say with the Psalmist, "Woe is me, that I am constrained to dwell with Mesech, and to have my habitation among the tents of Kedar!" (Ps. cxx. 4). But through our Communions our Lord comes to dwell with us in our exile, to be the "Esca Viatorum," the Pilgrims' Bread, refreshing us on our journey, and giving us even here a foretaste of the joys of home, of Heaven, as well as a pledge that He will guide us thither.

iii Consolation and guidance in our exile.

Our last misery in this world is the crumbling of our bodies into dust. By decay and loss of strength in ourselves or in others we are constantly reminded that death awaits us at the end of this life of sorrow. But "as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22); and the chief means by which we may possess this gift of eternal life is feeding upon our Lord's Body. Once again we may recall the words, "Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

iv. The pledge and means of resurrection to eternal life.

How rich are the fruits of the Holy Communion! How wonderful are its effects! All that we require for our life here, all that we can need to bring us to our true life hereafter! With what love, with what humility, with what gratitude should we approach the Holy Sacrament! With this to help us, how easy it should be to obey the injunction, "Tarry thou the LORD'S leisure; be strong, and He shall comfort thine heart; and put thou thy trust in the LORD" (Ps. xxvii. 16).

But that these fruits may be ours we must come to the Holy Communion with right dispositions, with proper preparation. What are the dispositions re-

III. Dispositions and preparation.

quired? They are but two. (1) As regards the *soul*, we should be free from mortal sin, and therefore in a state of grace; we should have faith, and hope, and love, all of which are but the effects of being in a state of grace, since they were infused into us at our Baptism. All this comes under the general head of freedom from mortal sin. (2) As regards the *body*, we should be fasting from all food and drink since midnight. Let us take each of these separately.

1. Preparation of the soul.

While freedom from mortal sin is the necessary condition for any beneficial reception of the Blessed Sacrament, since those who eat and drink unworthily are "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. . . . For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body" (1 Cor. xi. 27 and 29); yet much more than this is required to secure all the fruits of a good Communion. S. Thomas, whose teaching we have been following in regard to the fruits of Communion, arranges the exercises of preparation for Communion under three heads, each with three subdivisions.

i. The dignity of the Holy Sacrament demands:

If we realize the exceeding solemnity of the Holy Sacrament, that in it we receive the very Body of our Lord and GOD, and that S. Paul warns us so earnestly of the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof, our preparation will require three things, out of regard for the dignity of the Holy Sacrament: (1) Faith; (2) Purity; (3) Prayer.

(1) Faith.

"Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith." (Heb. x. 22). We must come to our Communions with faith, that is, not merely with an intellectual acceptance of the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament, but with a sincere effort to realize our Lord's Presence therein. We must come "discerning

the Lord's Body." And to this end, in our preparation for Communion we should make many acts of faith, that is, we should tell our Lord how truly and fully we believe what He has revealed to us of His Presence in this great Mystery. The repetition of some of the great Eucharistic hymns of the Church has been found very useful.

(2) Purity.

"Let us draw near . . . having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." (Heb. x. 22). If it was said to those whose work it was to carry the vessels of the Temple, "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the LORD" (Isa. lii. 11), how much more is it said to those who bear not the vessels, but the LORD Himself! For in the Holy Communion we become, as it were, the very shrine of the Blessed Sacrament. We read that Joseph of Arimathæa, when he had taken the Body of JESUS, "wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock." (S. Matt. xxvii. 59, 60). How like a rock are our hearts in hardness, and that hardness caused by sin! We must by our contrition hew out a place in them, like the new tomb prepared for the Body of the Lord. The clean linen cloth (from which, it has been said, the rule of the Church to use a fair linen instead of a silk cloth for the celebration of the Sacrament of the Altar took its origin) also tells of the purity with which we must come to our Communions.

And the three things which contribute to the whiteness and cleanness of the linen corporal, which is used at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, may suggest aids to us in cleansing our souls. (1) The corporal is washed; (2) it is wrung out; (3) it is dried.

(a) The cleansing of the soul.

If our souls are to be made thoroughly clean before receiving the Lord's Body we must first wash them with the water of penitential tears, making acts of contrition, praying "Wash me throughly from my wickedness, and cleanse me from my sin." (Ps. li. 2).

(b) Works of penance.

Our souls must be wrung, as it were, by works of penitence. We must not be content merely with expressions of sorrow, but we must "bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance." (S. Luke iii. 8).

(c) Kindling of charity.

And thirdly, our tears must be dried by the fervent heat of Divine charity in our souls.

(3) Prayer.

There must be not only the preparation of faith and purity, but the preparation of prayer. For not only did Joseph of Arimathæa wrap the Body in a clean linen cloth, but Mary Magdalene and the other holy women brought sweet spices and ointments with which to anoint that dear Body; and these spices signify the offering of prayers in our preparation for the Holy Eucharist. In this way we not only cleanse but adorn the chamber of our soul, so that our Lord when He comes may find it not only empty and swept, but "garnished" and ready for His Presence. (S. Matt. xii. 44). Throughout our preparation we must ask the Holy Ghost to help us; and here we may well pray: "Awake, O north Wind, and come, thou south; blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out. Let my Beloved come into His garden, and eat His pleasant fruits." (Cant. iv. 16).

ii. Lessons taught by the bread used.

S. Thomas also proposes as a help in our preparation that we should consider two things, the species of bread under which our Lord comes to us, and the Passover, which was the great type of the Blessed Sacrament. What is bread but grains of wheat which by the work of man have gradually attained to the per-

fection of bread? So the sinful soul by the grace of CHRIST attains to that good estate wherein it may beneficially receive His Body. The wheat is ground, sifted, and kneaded into bread. So the soul in its preparation must be (1) ground by contrition; (2) sifted by Confession; and (3) kneaded by Divine charity, love of GOD and of man.

iii. Lessons from the Paschal lamb

We may learn similar lessons from the Paschal lamb, —(1) from the lamb itself; (2) from the three ceremonies observed at the Paschal feast; (3) from the equipments of those who ate it.

(1) From the lamb itself.

The lamb itself was to be eaten at night, when things are not seen clearly, which signified that in the darkness of this life the Body of CHRIST would be given unto us not visibly, but veiled in a Sacrament.

The lamb was to be roasted with fire, which signified that both the Incarnation of our Lord and the Consecration of His Body were to be accomplished by the operation of the HOLY GHOST, Who is the Fire of GOD; and further, that in His Passion the Lamb of GOD was to be consumed in the fire of Divine love.

Here we are taught the need of faith and love, when we make our Communion.

(2) From the three ceremonies at the Feast.

There were three accompaniments of the Paschal feast, for GOD said: "They shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and *unleavened bread;* and with *bitter herbs* they shall eat it. . . . And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it *in the blood* that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two side posts with the blood that is in the bason." (Ex. xii. 8 and 22). The bitter herbs signify the sorrow for sin, and the unleavened bread tells of the pure intention with which we are to come; and the blood of the lamb

speaks of the memory and imitation of our Lord's Passion wherewith the faithful soul prepares itself.

(3) From the equipments of the eaters.

Those who ate of the Paschal lamb were to be equipped as for a journey, for GOD commanded: "And thus shall ye eat it; with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand." (Ex. xii. 11). Here the *girdle* may be taken as symbolical of continence and purity; the *shoes*, of following in the steps of CHRIST and His Saints—as S. Paul says, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of CHRIST" (1 Cor. xi. 1); the *staff*, of correction and penance,—as the Psalmist says: "I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff comfort me." (Ps. xxiii. 4).

Summary of preparation of the soul.

We may sum up this work of preparation under the three heads which S. Thomas says the dignity of the Blessed Sacrament demands: (1) acts of faith; (2) self examination, followed by Contrition and Confession and the purpose of Satisfaction; and (3) acts of prayer; and especially the regular office of preparation, which usually consists of some Psalms, among them the eighty-fourth Psalm, with certain versicles and prayers, and is found in most books of devotion. Some such office should never be omitted.

We should always come with some special intention, that is, with a prayer asking for some *special* gift in the Holy Eucharist.

2. Preparation of the body.

We have said that the conditions for obtaining the benefits of Communion are two: preparation of the soul, and of the body. The first we have considered. Let us now take the second.

Fasting Communion the law of the Church.

The body must be prepared by fasting. This disciplinary enactment has been the absolute law of the Catholic Church everywhere, probably from the time of S. Paul. In the laxity which followed the upheaval

in England in the sixteenth century, this, with many other disciplinary laws of the Church, was gradually neglected until it was almost lost sight of. But a law is in force until it has been repealed, and there is no statute or canon of the Church of England in any way abrogating this law.

S. Augustine's witness to this law.

Regarding the practice of the early Church we could not have a better witness than S. Augustine, who in his epistle to Januarius says, "it pleased the HOLY GHOST to appoint, for the honour of so great a Sacrament, that the Body of the Lord should take the precedence of all other food entering the mouth of a Christian, and it is for this reason that the custom referred to is universally observed." S. Augustine wrote this about A.D. 400, and we have similar statements in the second century from Tertullian, in the third from S. Cyprian, and in the fourth from S. Basil, S. Ambrose, S. Gregory Nazianzen, and, a little later, from S. Chrysostom. We also find many canons of local and provincial councils enforcing this rule.

Other Fathers.

Report of the committee of the English House of Bishops in 1894.

Of the universality of this law we can scarcely have better evidence than that afforded by the report of the committee of the House of Bishops of the Church of England, presented to Convocation on May 5th, 1894. From this report we extract the following :

"2. That the practice of communicating in the early morning appears to have arisen about the close of the first century, probably in order to secure a safer as well as a more reverent Celebration, and, by the time of S. Cyprian, to have become so fully established that it was regarded not only as the preferable but as the *proper* practice and as commemorative of the Lord's Resurrection.

"3. That the practice of communicating in the early morning, together with the common association of fasting with prayer, led to the practice of communicating only when fasting, and that fasting reception of the Communion became the *regular* and *recognized* usage of the Church before the end of the fourth century.

"4. That from the close of the fourth century this regular and recognized usage was formulated in rules for the clergy in canons of local and provincial councils.

"5. That fasting reception of the Communion was the prescribed rule of the Church of England during the Anglo-Saxon period, and continued to be so to the time of the Reformation.

"6. That these strict rules were nevertheless subject to relaxation in cases of sickness or other necessity."

This report may be looked upon as a somewhat unwilling witness of five English Bishops to the fact of the *universality of the law* of fasting Communion. Probably there are no customs and very few articles of faith for which greater antiquity or universality can be adduced. The Bishops, however, in their report, draw from these premises the following extraordinary conclusion:

Their extraordinary conclusion.

"7. That at the Reformation the Church of England, in accordance with the principle of liberty laid down in Article XXXIV., ceased to require the Communion to be received fasting, though the practice was observed by many as a reverent and ancient custom, and as such is commended by several of her eminent writers and divines down to the present time."

Fallacy of their argument from Article XXXIV.

The Article to which they refer says: "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church

ordained *only by man's authority*, so that all things be done to edifying."

We may observe in regard to this that S. Augustine says that "it pleased the HOLY GHOST to appoint" this law (so that it is *not* only by man's authority), and further that S. Paul was the Apostle through whom the rule was made, and that it was occasioned by scandals such as S. Paul describes when, referring to the evening Communion at Corinth, he says that the recipients ate and drank damnation to themselves on account of their irreverence (1 Cor. xi. 20–24).

i. Not "only by man's authority," if S. Augustine is correct in his judgment.

Moreover, the Church of England never has changed or abrogated this law by any canonical or synodical act whatever, so that Article XXXIV. does not apply.

ii. Law never changed or abrogated by the Church of England.

And, even if the Bishops of the Church of England had attempted to change this law they would have been acting quite *ultra vires*, since a National Church is not competent to change anything which is of œcumenical authority. Fasting Communion is the law of the whole Church, observed just as strictly by the East as by the West, and therefore no *part* of the Church has power to abrogate it. It stands on precisely the same footing as the observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's Day, and a National Church has no more power to abolish it than it has to abolish the observance of Sunday.

iii. Such action quite ultra vires.

Lastly, to its disuse may be traced the shocking irreverence and neglect with which the Blessed Sacrament was treated in the Church of England until some fifty years ago, and the consequent loss of faith in the Real Presence.

iv. To its neglect may be traced irreverence and loss of faith.

We may observe in conclusion that the law of fasting Communion will generally require persons to make

their Communions at an early Celebration. But if they are obliged to communicate at a late Celebration there must be no relaxation of the rule of fasting. The exception to the rule is when a person is dying; such an one is permitted to receive the Viaticum without fasting. The same exception will probably apply to the case of a priest who is called unexpectedly after he has broken his fast to celebrate for a dying person where it is impossible to obtain the Reserved Sacrament.

The Viaticum the only exception to this rule.

IV. Three methods of eating.

S. Thomas observes that there are three ways of feeding on the Body and Blood of CHRIST. The recipient may eat (1) sacramentally only; or (2) spiritually only; or (3) both sacramentally and spiritually.

1. Sacramentally only.

The first is the manner in which those who are in a state of sin partake of the Sacrament, for while they "press with their teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST," to which is necessarily united the "Res Sacramenti" which is the very Body and Blood of CHRIST, "yet in no wise are they *partakers* of CHRIST," that is, they have no capacity for feeding upon Him spiritually. He is present in them, as He is in the tabernacle where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, but He has no spiritual relation to them; on the contrary they "eat and drink damnation to themselves."

2. Spiritually only.

Where we are not able to make a Sacramental Communion, Spiritual Communion may be made by earnestly hungering and thirsting after CHRIST and beseeching Him to come spiritually into our souls. In most books of devotion some act of Spiritual Communion may be found, which may be used for this purpose. In the rubric at the end of the Prayer-Book Office for the Communion of the Sick we read: "But if a man either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want

of warning in due time to the Minister, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, the Minister shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that JESUS CHRIST hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed His Blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefor, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour CHRIST profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth." There was a similar rubric in the Sarum Missal; this teaching therefore obtained before the Reformation. From it we may learn that if for any good reason we are unable to make our Communion sacramentally (if, for instance, there is no early Celebration and we are not able to fast until a late one, or if we are in some place where there is no Celebration in our own Church, or if from sickness we are unable to go to Church), we can to our soul's health feed on the Body and Blood of CHRIST by making an act of Spiritual Communion.

Generally the best way to do this is to take some hour when we know the Holy Mysteries are being celebrated in Church, and, placing ourselves in intention with the congregation there, to make our act of Spiritual Communion about the time at which we think the Sacramental Communion is being administered.

3. Sacramentally and Spiritually.

The third mode of Communion refers to those who, coming to the Holy Communion with right dispositions, receive our Lord both sacramentally and spiritually, that is, receive not only the Body and Blood of CHRIST, but also the benefits which They confer on the faithful soul.

Thanksgiving.

In order that none of these graces may be lost, we should be very careful to make a good act of thanksgiving, and after the service is concluded should carefully use an office of thanksgiving before leaving the Church. This office generally consists of the Benedicite, and the 150th Psalm, with some versicles and prayers, and is found, like the preparation, in most books of devotion. Communicants should not be satisfied with this one thanksgiving only, but should continue their acts of thanksgiving for several days. The gift received in Communion is so great—nothing less than the Body and Blood of CHRIST Himself—that it demands that we should show forth our thanks "not only with our lips, but in our lives." Many who make a careful preparation lose some of the fruits of Communion which they would otherwise have had, by the carelessness and brevity of their thanksgiving.

Frequency of Communion.

The frequency with which Communion should be received must depend very much on the condition of the individual soul. The priest to whom we go for Confession is the best person to consult on this important matter. The rule of the Church requires that it shall not be less than once a year,* but of course no earnest soul would be content with only this.

Conclusion.

As the Holy Eucharist is the centre of the Church's life, so should our Communions be the acts round which all our spiritual life circles. And they will be so, if we realize the blessings which our LORD loves to bestow upon the faithful soul in Communion.

* The English Church requires three times a year.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE LITURGY.

Introductory.

THE history of the Church may be studied from many points of view, and may be read in many books, not only in those of parchment and paper, but also in those of stone. Indeed, that which gives to our Cathedrals their fascinating interest is not merely the beauty of their architecture or the grandeur of their proportions, but the fact that they are books in which one may read the history of the Church written on lasting tablets of stone.

York Minster.

Take, for instance, York Minster. How far it carries us back when we try to realize that on its site stood a Church built of wood, in which King Edwin the Saxon was baptized on Easter Day A.D. 627! Though that temporary Church perished, the remains of the noble basilica of stone (which, at the suggestion of Paulinus, Edwin after his Baptism began to construct) may still be seen in the central wall of the crypt below the choir,—the only relic of the Church of that period. Archbishop Thomas, A.D. 1070–1100, the first Norman prelate, rebuilt the Saxon Church "as well as he could," or rather built upon it the structure round which was raised the great Cathedral as it stands to-day. To those who have learned to read in the book of architecture, what a story York Minster tells of the

vicissitudes of the Church of CHRIST for nearly thirteen centuries!

I. The Liturgy of the Church to many a hidden treasure.

We cannot all worship in a Cathedral which has the glorious memories of York, but we all have in our Liturgy a treasure, like that which the man in the Parable found hid in a field (S. Matt. xiii. 44), one that is unrecognized by many, and yet contains the richest associations of the Church's life from its very beginning.

Carries us back to the first Maundy Thursday.

For our Liturgy has a history which goes back not thirteen but nineteen centuries, to the night in which our dear Lord and Master was betrayed, to the moment when He took into His holy hands the bread and wine and instituted the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. For the words of Institution spoken by our Blessed Lord on the night of Maundy Thursday are the nucleus round which has gathered all the liturgical worship of the Church.

The study of Liturgics is a special branch of theology, and we cannot enter into it here more than to point out in the briefest way some links in the chain which binds our Liturgy to the words which were used by our Lord in the upper chamber at Jerusalem.

Bp. Lightfoot's introduction to S. Clement's epistle to the Corinthians

In A.D. 1877 the late Bishop Lightfoot wrote an introduction to the newly-discovered portion of the epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians, a document of great antiquity, and in sacred authority second only to the writings of the Apostles, since it was a letter from one who himself had received the Gospel from the mouths of S. Peter and S. Paul.

Points out traces of liturgical prayers.

His three questions.

Bishop Lightfoot points out that the epistle contains most distinct echoes of the prayers which are found in the ancient Liturgies, and asks three questions: (1) Has S. Clement used a portion of a fixed form of words *then* in use in the Roman Church (that is about A.D.

100)? (2) Or have the ancient Liturgies borrowed directly from S. Clement's epistle? (3) Or do they owe their resemblance to some common and older type of liturgy from which both have drawn?

Traces of a form of liturgy in S. Paul's writings,

We find also in the Epistles of S. Paul many traces of the existence of a form of liturgy, as for instance where he quotes passages from recognized writings which are not Scripture, introducing them with the expression "as it is written," or "this is a faithful saying." Among these we may place the following texts: 1 Cor. ii. 9; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26; 1 Cor. x. 16 (the act of Consecration); 1 Cor. xiv. 15 (the Amen of the Eucharist); Rom. xvi. 16 (the Kiss of Peace).

And in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But it is in the Epistle to the Hebrews that these quotations occur most abundantly, and some have even thought that the Epistle is a commentary on the Liturgy then in use, illustrating its doctrinal teaching and connecting it with the ritual of the Jewish dispensation.

The Apostolic Liturgy.

Many liturgiologists have reached the conclusion that before the Apostles separated for their various missionary spheres of labour they agreed among themselves upon a form for the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist which is known as the Apostolic Liturgy. This form was probably committed to memory. For during the period of persecution, which lasted through the first three centuries of the Church's life, the "disciplina arcani" apparently prevented the use of a written liturgy. And though we find that apostates gave up the sacred Scriptures and vestments and treasures of the Church, there is no evidence of their having surrendered any books of Divine worship.

At first unwritten but committed to memory, The "disciplina arcani."

No service books surrendered by the traditores.

Written Liturgies date from the time of Constantine.

After the conversion of Constantine the necessity for secrecy was removed, and written Liturgies rapidly multiplied. The earliest complete Eucharistic Service

The Apostolic Constitutions.

preserved to us is that in the eighth book of the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, which seems to have been written no later than A.D. 320.

Five families of Liturgies.

At a somewhat later date, if we take all the existing Liturgies which are known to us, we find that they fall into five groups, or families: the Liturgy of S. James (or Jerusalem); of S. Mark (or Alexandria); of SS. John and Paul (or Ephesus); of S. Peter or S. Clement (or Rome); and of S. Thaddæus, or Adæus, and Maris (or Edessa). These five show a remarkable similarity of structure rather than of words, which can only be accounted for by supposing them all to have been taken from some common ancestor; and from these five families all the existing Liturgies of the Christian Church have been derived.

Probably all descended from the Apostolic Liturgy.

Sameness of structure in all.

What grammar is to language, structure is to a Liturgy. As in languages which apparently have little kinship we observe the same elementary principles of grammar, the same parts of speech, the same use of inflection; so do we find in all the Liturgies of the Christian Church throughout the world the same general structure.

The Liturgy of the British Church probably Ephesian like the Gallican.

The Liturgy of our Church Petrine or Roman.

The Liturgy of the early British Church was probably derived, through the Gallic Liturgy, from Asia Minor, and may be traced to the family which bears the name of S. John and S. Paul. S. Augustine, however, when in A.D. 597 he landed in England, brought with him the Liturgy of the Roman Church, which soon displaced the other. So that our Liturgy, while possessing some characteristics of its own, belongs to the group which bears the name of S. Peter.

II. Liturgies divided into two parts.

Anaphora and Pro-Anaphora.

All Liturgies are found to be divisible in their structure into two distinct parts, the Anaphora and the Pro-Anaphora,—the Missa Fidelium and the Missa Catechumenorum. Some have thought that these

parts were originally distinct, (the Pro-Anaphora being an office of preparation and an amplification of the latter part of the Schacharith, or Sabbath Day Service of the Synagogue, which in times of persecution became joined to the Eucharistic Service proper,) and that the faithful attended both, while candidates for Baptism and the penitents attended only the Pro-Anaphora, which ended with their dismissal and so acquired the name "Missa Catechumenorum,"—the Anaphora being called the "Missa Fidelium."

The term "Mass."

This term "Missa" has probably given the familiar name "Mass" to the Eucharistic Service of the West.

Its derivation.

The derivation and meaning of the word is very uncertain. Most probably it came from the word "missio" (from mittere), signifying the dismissal of an assembly. Possibly the use of the term as applied to the Holy Eucharist arose from the words "Ite: missa est," at the end of the Liturgy; or, more probably, as some think, from the dismissal of the catechumens at the end of the Pro-Anaphora. The word "Mass" is, however, very ancient, being used by S. Ambrose in his twentieth epistle, written about A.D. 385; and as it is absolutely unconnected in its origin with any doctrinal idea, it would seem to be both convenient and entirely unobjectionable. It was used at the Reformation in the first English Prayer Book, where the Service is entitled, "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion; commonly called the Mass."

Used by S. Ambrose, A.D. 385.

And in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.

Ordinary and Canon.

The two main divisions of our Liturgy, the Ordinary and Canon, are sometimes subdivided into five parts, the *Ordinary* into the Introduction and Offertory, and the *Canon* into the Consecration or Canon proper, the Communion, and the Post-Communion or Thanksgiving.

1. Ordinary.

i. Introduction.

The first main division, the Ordinary, begins with the Introduction. This contains the first part of the Liturgy, ending in our Prayer Book with the Creed.

ii. Offertory.

The Offertory begins with the offering of the bread and wine upon the Altar, and comprises the rest of the Ordinary. The greater part of this section is peculiar to the Anglican Liturgy, containing as it does the Exhortation, Confession, Absolution and Comfortable Words, since nothing corresponding to these is found *in this place* in other Liturgies.

2. Canon.

The second great division is the Canon, which begins with the Consecration Prayer and continues to the end of the Service; although some consider that as the Sursum Corda, Preface and Sanctus are the introduction to the Canon, they should therefore be included in this division.

i. Consecration.
ii. Communion.
iii. Post-Communion.

The Canon is divided into the Canon proper, or Prayer of Consecration; the Communion (that is, the Communion of the priest and people); and the Post-Communion, or Thanksgiving, which follows, though it is not strictly part of the Canon.

III. The ritual of the Liturgy.

Not only is our Liturgy a treasure inherited from the earliest ages of Christianity, but every part of the Service has been regulated by authority, so that the ritual which accompanies the Eucharistic Service is not left to the individual taste of the priest who celebrates, but is ordered in almost every detail by rubrics and ecclesiastical decrees.

Source of the Mosaic ritual.

Moses was ordered to arrange all the details of Jewish worship in accordance with the pattern he had seen in the mount (Heb. viii. 5; Ex. xxv. 40); and S. John, by the vision which he recorded in the Revelation (chap. i.), largely set the pattern of the ritual of the Christian Church; so that it may be said to

Of the Church's ritual.

have the authority of GOD Himself and to represent the worship of Heaven. We may go further and say that as in Heaven S. John saw in the midst of the throne the Lamb as It had been slain; so the ritual of the Church, while it carries us forward in thought to the glorious worship in which we hope some day to take our part in Heaven, also takes us back to the Passion of CHRIST by which man was redeemed from the bondage of sin and made once more the heir of Heaven.

It carries us forward to Heaven.

And backward to Calvary.

Before we examine the symbolism of the Liturgy, we may observe that the architecture of the Church itself is intended to teach us a lesson.

The symbolism of Church architecture.

A Gothic Church generally has seven pillars, typifying the house of Wisdom which the book of Proverbs (chap. ix. 1) tells us is built on seven pillars; reminding us also of the Seven Sacraments and of the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, by which the Church on earth is supported and sustained.

The term "nave," which is applied to the part of the building where the people sit and which represents the Church on earth—is from the Latin word *navis*, which means a ship. It helps to remind us that whilst we are in the Church on earth we must be tossed upon the waves of the world, and of that tempestuous voyage which we must endure before we can enter the Church in Heaven. In the nave are the font, pulpit, lectern and litany desk: the font to tell us that the only entrance to the Church on earth is by Baptism; the pulpit and lectern to remind us that during our pilgrimage we need instruction; the litany desk to teach us that, whilst on earth, we need to send up our prayers and penitential devotions to GOD.

The nave.

The "chancel" represents the Church in Heaven. Between it and the nave is the rood-screen, with its

The chancel.

gates, typifying death—that death through which we must pass before we can enter the Church in Heaven. It is not now a heavy screen, hiding Heaven, as death did under the Old Covenant, but (since our Lord died, and by His Resurrection overcame death) an open screen, through which we can see, with open gates reminding us that death is the gate of everlasting life, and that it has been robbed of all its terrors by our Blessed Lord's Resurrection.

The choir.

In the chancel sits the choir, robed in white, symbolical of the Heavenly choir, which S. John tells us in the Revelation he saw attired in white raiment. Here the most prominent and most important feature is the

The Altar.

Altar. It represents the throne of our Blessed Lord; for S. John writes in chapter iv. of the Revelation, "Behold, a door stood open in Heaven"; "and behold, a throne was set up in Heaven, and One sat on the throne"; and again he tells us that he saw before the throne seven golden candlesticks, or as they are called in another place, "seven golden lamps."

The Altar teaches us two truths: first, it is the throne to which our Lord comes to reign for a little while; secondly, it tells of the Atonement, which was made on Calvary for the sins of the whole world. And because

The cross.

the Altar typifies Calvary it is surmounted by a cross.

The candles.

Upon it are candles, which are lighted by day. This is to teach us that the light of faith is altogether different from the mere light of this world's day, the light of nature; and to remind us of Heaven, where there is always light, for we are told "there is no night there." Instead of seven candlesticks there are but six, the cross taking the place of the seventh. This change was introduced in order to make everything speak of the Passion of our Lord. The cross was placed in the

midst, with the Christian motto, "*Crux est mea lux*" —the cross is my light. Briefly, then, the Altar represents two things: the Throne and Calvary; the Incarnation and the Atonement, two of the great Mysteries, two of the foundation doctrines of the Christian religion, which are accepted by every Christian body—the Blessed Sacrament being the extension of the Incarnation, and the memorial of the Passion.

The Altar cloths.

Upon the Altar itself are three thicknesses of linen, typifying the grave-clothes found in the tomb. At the celebration of the Holy Eucharist there is also spread upon it a small square of linen, called the corporal, upon which are placed the chalice and Altar breads, and which represents the napkin which was bound about our Blessed Lord's head. Everything about the Blessed Sacrament, everything about the Altar, tells us of the Passion, of the Atonement of our Blessed Lord.

The five colours.

In the vestments, both of the Altar and of the priest, five different colours are used: *white*, the emblem of purity, which is used on Festivals of our Blessed Lord, on Festivals of the Blessed Virgin, of the Angels, of Confessors and Virgins, and on All Saints' Day; *red*, typifying blood and fire, which is used on Whitsunday, when the tongues of fire came down upon the Apostles, and on Feasts of Martyrs, who shed their blood for their Lord; *violet*, typifying penitence, speaking of sin that must be repented of, which is used during the seasons of Advent and Lent; *green*, the colour with which GOD clothed the earth, the colour which tells of hope, and is used during the summer months and when there is no penitential season; and lastly, *black*, telling of sin and its penalty death, which is used at funerals and on Good Friday.

Vestments of the priest.

The vestments of the priest have, each of them, a symbolical meaning; every article has its own sermon, which it preaches on the Passion of our Lord. In the Old Testament the vestments ordered by GOD were of two kinds, the linen vestments and what were called "the beautiful garments." So we have the linen vestments, the alb and the surplice, and "the beautiful garments," the cope, the chasuble and the stole.

In vesting for a Celebration of the Holy Eucharist the priest puts on:

1. The cassock.

The *Cassock*, a black coat, reaching to the ground, and girded at the waist by the *cincture*. These remind him and others, that being a priest, he is vowed to be separate from the world; and help him to recall the verse in the Gospel for the Ordination of Deacons: "Let your loins be *girded* about and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like *men who wait for their Lord*."

2. The amice.

The *Amice*, a square piece of linen with a collar, put first over the head, and then around the neck. This typifies the helmet of salvation, which S. Paul says we are to put on; and the cloth with which our Blessed Lord was blindfolded in His Passion.

3. The alb.

The *Alb*, which typifies purity, is a long linen vestment with sleeves.

4. The girdle.

The *Girdle*, which symbolizes, on the one hand, truth —S. Paul says we are to put on the girdle of truth—and on the other, the cords with which our Lord was bound before his Crucifixion; it also symbolizes continence.

5. The stole.

The *Stole*, which symbolizes the yoke of CHRIST—"Take my yoke upon you"—and the rope by which our Lord was dragged to the place of His death.

6. The maniple.

The *Maniple*, like a small stole, which typifies obedience, and represents the cords with which our Lord's hands were bound; it reminds us that the priest is the slave of JESUS CHRIST.

The *Chasuble*, which typifies the seamless robe of CHRIST, and tells of the unity of the Church, which can be rent only by schism, and of that charity which covers all things. 7. The chasuble.

The symbolism of the vestments is sometimes explained differently, as for instance in the prayers said by the priest while vesting, according to the Roman rite.

Among the other important ritual points is the use of *Incense*. Incense is probably the most scriptural of all the ritual adjuncts. Not only did GOD order in the Old Testament that it should be used, but He even went so far as to say exactly how it should be made. Incense.

Again, Malachi, the last of the Prophets, prophesying of our Lord's coming, says "in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure offering." The "pure offering" refers to the Holy Eucharist, and he prophesies that in every place incense shall be offered with it.

This verse, Malachi i. 11, is one of the Sentences in the American Prayer Book, and another is,—"Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the incense, and let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice" (Ps. cxli. 2). Again, we find in the Revelation, in the worship of Heaven, the Angel offering "much incense" with the prayers of the Saints (chap. viii. 3).

What does incense typify? Simply this: the merits of CHRIST, which go up with the prayers of the Saints as a sweet savour before GOD the FATHER. Our prayers would be worthless without the merits of CHRIST, and so the Angel is represented as taking the prayers that come up from the Church on earth and mingling them with incense—the merits of CHRIST—and offering them before the throne of GOD.

Incense, then, is a part of the law of the Church's

worship, dating from the time of Moses, seen by S. John in Heaven, and used by the Church on earth.

Genuflection.

Another important ritual point is *Genuflection*. This is a customary act of reverence to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, and is ordinarily made on entering and leaving a Church when the Blessed Sacrament is present, on passing an altar where it is reserved, and on leaving our places to go up to the sanctuary to make our Communion. Here also may be mentioned the custom of bowing to the altar when we enter the Church. We genuflect when our Blessed Lord is upon His Altar throne to recognize His presence; and on entering the Church, when our Lord is not present, we bow to the empty throne.

This is simply the translation into the Church of the good manners that have prevailed for centuries among people in Europe and other places. In England, when the Queen is opening Parliament and is on her throne, everyone genuflects; when she is not present, when the throne is empty and some one else opens Parliament as her deputy, they bow to the throne. Bowing to the altar, then, means no act of adoration to *it;* but it can be put upon the same ground with bowing to one another on the street. When we bow to one another we mean to treat one another with respect, but not to "worship" one another.

The Sign of the Cross.

The use of the *Sign of the Cross* is a very ancient and most significant ritual act. It may be best explained by the following quotation: "You ask me why I make the sign of the Cross? I answer you that the first official act of the Church, after by Baptism I had entered her fold, was to make upon my forehead the sign of the Cross. And as I am continually reminded to look back upon my Baptism, its privileges

and responsibilities, I cannot but think that the Church meant me to go on with the practice she there taught me.

So I make the sign of the Cross when I am tempted, to remind myself of Him Who, by the power of the Cross, overcame the Tempter. I make it when I begin my prayers as a recognition that all prayer gains its efficacy through the Crucified. I make it when I am absolved, in token that my pardon was sealed upon the Cross. I make it at the benediction, because from those dear hands outstretched upon the Cross all blessings come. I make it at the words 'Life everlasting' in the Creed, because I desire to profess my belief that by the Cross life everlasting was won, and that it is only by bearing the Cross that I can enter into life everlasting. I cannot think it wrong or unnecessary since, as far back as the days of Tertullian, I find it was the universal practice of all Christians."

The whole service of the Church, and all its worship is full of meaning. It is not made up of superstitious legends, but is all woven around the death of our *Lord Jesus Christ:* for as in the Holy Eucharist we mystically show forth the Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST, so in the Liturgy and its ritual all has been ordered to remind us of the life and death of our Blessed Lord summed up in the Eucharistic Offering.

IV. The Service may be taken to remind us of the principal acts of our Lord's life.

When we are present at the Mass, not to make our Communion, but for the purpose of offering the Holy Sacrifice, it is often most helpful to use the different parts of the Service to bring mentally before us those great acts of our Lord's life which are so intimately connected with our redemption.

Introit.

There are many ways in which we may do this. For instance, we may consider the Introit as reminding us of the songs of the Angels at our Lord's Nativity,

or of the Hosannas of the children as He rode into Jerusalem. The first Lord's Prayer may well remind us of CHRIST teaching the Disciples to pray. In the Commandments and Kyries we may see CHRIST promulgating the moral law of the Christian Church in the Sermon on the Mount, or in Holy Week in the Temple teaching the people. The Epistle, read towards the south, represents CHRIST offering His Kingdom to the Jews. The priest crossing over to the north to read the Gospel tells of CHRIST, rejected by the Jews, turning to the Gentiles, who lay in darkness and in the shadow of death. The Creed tells us of the Holy Catholic Church throughout the world proclaiming her faith in our Lord's teaching.

Our FATHER. Commandments and Kyries. Epistle. Gospel. Creed.

Passing to the Anaphora, the Oblation of the bread and wine reminds us of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist; the offering of alms, of the gifts of the Magi or the ointment of S. Mary Magdalene, or of the women who ministered to CHRIST of their substance. The Exhortation tells us of CHRIST at the entrance of Gethsemane, bidding His Disciples watch and pray, lest they enter into temptation. The Confession represents our Blessed Lord in His agony in the Garden, as the pattern penitent, confessing the sins of all the world; the Comfortable Words remind us of the angel consoling Him. The Jews exclaimed, "Crucify Him, crucify Him!" but we, "with Angels and Archangels," sing: "Holy, Holy, Holy, LORD GOD of Hosts, Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O LORD Most High. Amen." The Prayer of Humble Access shows us our Blessed Lord on the way to Calvary, falling beneath His Cross. The Prayer of Consecration brings before us the Crucifixion; the Fracture of the Host telling of the breaking of His Body with the

Offertory. Bread and wine. Alms. Exhortation. Confession. Comfortable Words. Sanctus. Prayer of Humble Access. Consecration. Fracture of the Host.

nails; and the Elevation, of the Lifting up of the Cross. Elevation.

Then, in the Communion of the people we may see our Lord taken down from the Cross and laid in the tomb. The covering the Chalice with the pall reminds us of the white linen and napkin of the sepulchre. The Gloria, when all rise with a burst of song, tells of His Resurrection; and the Benediction reminds us of our Lord's Ascension from the Mount of Olives, when "He lifted up His Hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while He blessed them, He was parted from them, and carried up into Heaven. (S. Luke xxiv. 50, 51). Communion of the people. Covering of the Chalice. Gloria in Excelsis. Benediction.

So the service of the Holy Eucharist carries us from our Lord's Birth at Bethlehem to His Ascension from Bethany, and leaves us, like the Apostles, after having worshipped Him, to return to our work with great joy, praising and blessing GOD.

A few practical hints to communicants may finish this chapter. V. Hints to communicants.

Those who wish to communicate should be in their places in Church at least five minutes before the Service begins.

When the time comes for them to go up to the sanctuary to receive, they should, on leaving their seat and on returning to it, genuflect in recognition of our Lord's Presence.

Our Lord's Body should be received in the palm of the right hand, under which the left has been placed so as to form a cross, both gloves having, of course, been removed.

At the Communion of the Blood of CHRIST it is generally best to guide the Chalice to the lips by taking a firm hold of the base, since the priest should not let it leave his hands.

On returning to their place in Church communicants should remember that this is the great time for intercession, when our Lord is sacramentally present with them ; and while others are being communicated, and until the priest resumes the Service, they should occupy themselves earnestly with their prayers for themselves and for others.

The Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice for quick and dead, and it is customary to make the commemorations or intercessions for the living just before the Consecration Prayer, and the commemorations of the Faithful Departed just after the Consecration Prayer has been concluded. In both these places a pause is made by the priest, during which he privately makes his own commemorations and prayers.

Conclusion.

It is hoped that this brief treatment of the Liturgy and the ritual of the Holy Eucharist may lead some to study these matters more fully and to discover for themselves the treasures, rich not only in historical associations but in spiritual helpfulness, which are hidden in the goodly field of the Church's ceremonial and worship.

CHAPTER XIX.

PRAYER.

Introductory.

WE have discussed at some length the nature and effects of the Church's Sacraments. But while these are the chief means of grace, that is, the means by which actual grace is conveyed to the soul to meet its special needs, and by which habitual grace is increased, there is also another means of grace even more universally necessary than the Sacraments; and that is Prayer.

Analogy between the body and soul of man.

The laws which govern the body and the soul of man are in close analogy with one another, so that what is helpful or harmful to the one will generally be found to be the same to the other. For man's physical life, speaking roughly, two things are absolutely necessary—food and air. Deprived of either of these, he is unable to preserve the gift of life; and it is only when he has wholesome food and pure air that his body can exist in a thoroughly healthy condition.

Prayer the atmosphere of the soul's life.

Prayer is the atmosphere of the soul's life, the vital air which the soul breathes; so that one might as well expect to find a living man who does not breathe as a living Christian who does not pray.

The Sacraments are to the soul what food is to the body. But a man needs not only good food but pure air; and if the air which he breathes is vitiated

by poisonous exhalations, it will often produce those diseases which are grouped under the general term "malarious," indicating that they are the result of breathing bad or impure air. The souls of many Christians are doubtless starved by neglect of the Sacraments, the food of the spiritual life; but probably a still greater number suffer from that spiritual "malaria" which comes from bad prayer.

Spiritual malaria.

Bad prayer may be traced to many causes, but one, doubtless, is ignorance in regard to the nature and laws of prayer. Prayer seems to be and is such a simple thing that we forget that even simple things may be done badly.

I. The nature of prayer. Definition.

What is prayer? It has been described as the ascent of the soul to GOD, the link which connects us with GOD, the ladder by which we climb up to Heaven. And this seems to be the inspired definition of prayer, since it is drawn from the words of the Psalmist, "Unto Thee, O LORD, do I lift up my soul" (Ps. xxv. i).

Three constituents of prayer.

The simplest analysis of an act of prayer shows us that its constituent parts are three. There must be (1) the suppliant, the person who makes the prayer; (2) one to whom it is made; and (3) a communication between the two; so that an act of prayer requires two terms and some contact between them.

1. The suppliant.

In order that a being may be capable of praying, he must have these two attributes: (i) he must be rational and possess free-will; (ii) he must be dependent.

i. He must be rational and possess free-will.

Religion, more than reason, distinguishes man from the brute. Though in the brute creation there are glimpses of reason, and in animals more closely associated with man even a lower form of intelligence, yet

none of the brutes is capable of prayer. The being who prays must be not only rational but possessed of free-will; that is, he must be what is termed a "moral being," understanding what he does, and accountable for doing it.

ii. He must be dependent.

Again, there can be no real prayer without a recognition and acknowledgment of dependence, and of infirmity. And here it is that so many fail in prayer. They do not come to GOD "poor in spirit" (S. Matt. v. 3), that is as beggars (for such is the literal meaning of the word πτωχοί in the first Beatitude) realizing their dependence on Him, and that this very realization constitutes their greatest claim upon His bounty. But they come in a mechanical, formal, or even patronizing way, telling GOD of their needs in a petulant, complaining spirit; and so they violate one of the essential conditions of the true suppliant, that he must realize his dependence. Their so-called prayers are "unheard" and unanswered, because really they are not prayers at all.

2. One to whom prayer is made.

To whom do we pray? There can be but one answer—GOD. For the Being Who can hear and answer prayer must be credited with two attributes, omniscience and omnipotence. Here again many fail, because they do not realize that GOD is omniscient, and therefore hears all prayer; and that He is omnipotent, and therefore able to grant all requests if they fulfil the conditions of prayer. Meditation on the attributes of GOD is therefore a great help to good prayers.

3. The act of prayer itself.

The act of prayer itself has been described as a movement from beneath, mind rising to mind, dependence to omnipotence. And we may see all these constituents of prayer mystically represented in the dream of Jacob at Beth-el (Gen. xxviii. 12). On the earth beneath

there was the patriarch, just exiled from his father's house; above was the LORD GOD, and between the two a ladder of communication; thus, while the vision was primarily a type of the Incarnation, it also mystically represents to us the act of prayer which like all other acts of grace finds its merit in the Incarnation.

Prayer the exercise of hope.

Again, we must bear in mind that prayer is the exercise of hope, and that hope is the spring of all human action; so that the man of action should be always a man of prayer. Hope, too, is the link between faith and love. Thus in true prayer all three virtues are necessarily exercised. For *faith* is the foundation of prayer—"Whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive" (S. Matt. xxi. 22); *hope*, the ladder by which faith ascends to love; and *love* the cord which not only binds man to GOD, but draws him even now to Heaven. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (S. John xii. 32); "I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love" (Hos. xi. 4).

Its foundation faith.

Its result love.

If any one desires to love GOD and complains of the coldness of his heart, he should pray, exercising the virtue of hope, until the flame of love is kindled within him and love unites his whole being to GOD.

II. The purpose of prayer.

We have tried to answer the question: What is prayer? We must now go on to consider a question which springs from this. Why do we pray? What is the purpose and end of prayer?

Many answers have been given, for prayer effects many things in this world; yet there is only one adequate answer, one which includes all others, and this answer is: "To fulfil the will of God."

To fulfil the will of GOD.

Two results of prayer.

If we examine the teaching of the Bible on this subject we find revealed there two results of prayer.

(1) There is, as the *objective* result, the obtaining from GOD those things which we need for our true life here, and which, be it noted, GOD wills to give us if we ask Him rightly in prayer; and (2) the *subjective* result in the conforming of our wills to the Divine will. Though these two results seem to be not only distinct but sometimes even contradictory, they really are not; for they are simply the objective and subjective aspects of the same purpose,—the fulfilment of the Divine will.

1. The objective result

It is GOD'S will to give us all things necessary for our true life and happiness, but the accomplishment of that will often depends upon the fulfilment of certain conditions, such as faith, prayer, and the use of means; and without these His will sometimes cannot be done by us and in us. For example, GOD gives us the gift of life, but conditions that gift by requiring that we breathe air, and eat food. If we will not fulfil these conditions we cannot retain the gift of life which GOD wills to give us; but the fault is entirely our own. Again, GOD wills to give us many good things to make life useful and happy, but in almost all of them we must co-operate with Him both by prayer and work. It is not enough to pray without working, or to work without praying; for prayer is the life of all work which has GOD'S blessing on it. Prayer, the exercise of hope, is (as we have said) the spring of all human action.

Depends on co-operation with GOD.

Prayer the motive power of spiritual life.

A watch may be constructed with great skill and the works may be in excellent order, but if it is not wound up it will not go. So prayer is the winding up of the mechanism of our spiritual nature, the storing of force by which our work is to be done. GOD gives His grace on the condition of prayer; this prayer really enables GOD'S will to be accomplished

in us. All this, of course, relates to the objective result of prayer.

2. The subjective result.

But if that for which we pray be not for our true good, and therefore not according to GOD'S will, which is always for our sanctification (1 Thess. iv. 3), then

The conforming of our will to GOD'S will.

prayer has its subjective result in conforming our will to the Divine will. For a part of all true prayer, either expressed or implied, must be the act of resignation, "Not my will, but Thine, be done." We see therefore that the adequate answer to the question "What is the end and purpose of prayer?" is found in the reply, "To fulfil GOD'S will." There are, as we have said, many ends of prayer, but all are really summed up in this reply. And the realization of its truth will enable us to meet the foolish objection which is sometimes brought against prayer, that it is an attempt to change GOD'S will, and therefore inconsistent with a belief in a righteous and immutable GOD.

The lesson of Gethsemane.

Among the lessons of our Lord's Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane none is perhaps more important than the revelation of the end and purpose of prayer. He prays first that the cup of the Passion may pass from Him: "O My FATHER, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me." Here is the objective side of prayer. Then He prays that not His own but His FATHER'S will may be done: "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." (S. Matt. xxvi. 39). Here is the subjective side. And the effect of this prayer of our Lord is seen, not in the withdrawal of the cup of the Passion but in the bestowal of strength which assisted His human will to meet with perfect calmness the fearful scenes of Good Friday, and throughout the Passion perfectly to do His FATHER'S will, and by that perfect obedience to redeem the human race. The

battle was fought out on His knees in Gethsemane; the victory was really won when He rose from His knees and went forth to meet His betrayer, to suffer and to die on Calvary for the world's salvation.

This pathetic scene should be to us the model of all true prayer, teaching us, as it does, that the one purpose of prayer is to enable man to fulfil the will of GOD, and that all great battles must be fought out, and all great victories won, upon our knees in prayer.

III. The conditions of prayer.

Having learned the nature of prayer, its purpose and end, we must now examine the conditions on which the efficacy of prayer depends; for prayer is not, like free will, a gift to be used by man absolutely as he pleases, for good or evil. Prayer can be used *only for what is good*. It has its limitations and conditions, which, if they are not observed, hinder or destroy the efficacy of prayer. As S. James says, "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss." (S. James iv. 3).

The chief conditions of prayer concern (1) the thing prayed for, (2) the suppliant, and (3) the manner of praying.

1. The matter.

That for which we pray, or "the matter" of prayer, must be *within the true sphere* of prayer, which is the will of GOD. For the sake of clearness let us take an illustration. From the same centre describe three concentric circles, and we have three zones. In the inner zone may be placed all those things which we know it is the will of GOD to give us, that is all things necessary for our sanctification, all spiritual blessings. For them we can pray with the assurance that GOD wills to give them to us. In the outer zone we may put those things which we know are *not* according to GOD'S Will, and for which it is therefore wrong to pray, such as the satisfaction of a vicious thirst for revenge,

Those things which are for our good.

Those things which are not for our good.

or success in some dishonest business venture. In the intermediate zone will be placed all that large class of temporal blessings which it may or may *not* be GOD'S will to give us, such as restoration to health, or success in our temporal affairs, or continuance of prosperity. For these we must pray with the reservation that we ask them only if they be for our ultimate good and, therefore, in accordance with GOD'S will.

Those temporal blessings about which we are uncertain.

In regard to the matter of prayer, then, we see that the condition is that it should be within the sphere of GOD'S will, that is, something GOD wills to give us because it is for our good.

2. The suppliant.

The condition of prayer as regards the suppliant is that he should be in a state of grace, and so should have the privilege which belongs to the child of GOD; or, if not in grace, that at least he should be seeking to repent. If the heart is set on sin and has no covenanted relation to GOD the prayer will be of no avail, however good its matter may be; for the Bible tells us, "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." (Prov. xxviii. 9, comp. Ps. lxvi. 18). In proportion to the closeness of the union between the soul and GOD,—and therefore to the sanctity of the suppliant,—will be the efficacy of his prayer. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." (S. James v. 16).

3. The manner.

There are some conditions respecting the manner of prayer, without which we are in danger of praying "amiss," and so of not receiving an answer to our petitions. Briefly, the conditions belonging to the manner of prayer are four: Faith, Hope, Humility and Perseverance.

i. Faith.

We must believe not only the doctrines of the Christian religion, but also GOD'S promises in regard to

prayer. We must believe that GOD both can hear and does hear our prayer; and further, we must *act* on this faith, like the nobleman whose son was sick of a fever at Capernaum. He left what seemed to be his son's death-bed to go to our Lord at Cana and beseech Him to heal his son; and when our Lord said, "Go thy way; thy son liveth" (S. John iv. 50), he so entirely accepted our Lord's words and believed that the prayer was answered, that he did not go home until the next day. (ver. 52). This was acting in the belief that his prayer was heard. And we must act in the same way, if our prayers are to be heard. If we pray for grace to withstand some temptation, we must act (when that temptation comes to us) just as one would act who fully believed that he had the grace to resist; and we shall find that we *can* resist. It is a law of grace that it is manifested only in action; that is, grace acts only when by our own efforts we co-operate with it.

ii. Hope.

We must not only believe that GOD hears our prayer, but we must hope for that which we ask of GOD. The reason many prayers fail is because we pray in such a hopeless way. We must remember that true prayer must always be the exercise of hope.

iii. Humility.

The very nature of prayer demands, too, that we should ask humbly; for prayer, as we have already noticed, is founded on a sense of our dependence on GOD. And this virtue of humility will preserve us from the dangers of presumption into which faith and hope might lead us, if unbalanced by humility.

iv. Perseverance.

And lastly, we must pray with perseverance. Our Lord spoke two parables to teach us that "men ought always to pray, and not to faint"—the parable of the Unjust Judge and the parable of the Friend at Midnight (S. Luke xviii. 1, and xi. 5); and in the miracle

of the healing of the daughter of the woman of Canaan (S. Matt. xv. 21–28) we have a most striking example of perseverance in prayer, even in spite of apparent repulses from our Lord Himself.

The woman of Canaan well illustrates all the conditions of prayer which we have been considering. In the *matter*, the deliverance of her daughter's soul from evil was according to GOD'S will; in the *suppliant*, her own disposition of heart was right; and in the *manner*, she manifested faith, hope, wonderful humility and great perseverance.

IV. The joy of prayer.

We notice next "the Joy of Prayer." Two things in our Lord's life show us the joy of prayer. One we have already glanced at—Gethsemane. The other is its contrast—Tabor, the Mount of Transfiguration. In Gethsemane after the Agony we see the joy of conscious power, of assured victory—in Him "Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross, despising the shame." (Heb. xii. 2). On Tabor we see the joy of conscious fellowship, of closest communion with GOD.

1. Gethsemane.

In Gethsemane, what was before our Blessed Lord? A work which seemed too great for human nature. Sin to be atoned for,—the world to be redeemed; and all in the weakness of His Perfect Humanity! As He kneels beneath the olive trees the clouds of darkness roll in upon His Soul, the sins of the human race, which He has to take upon Him that He may take them away. Before Him pass in dreadful procession all the sins of the world, which He has to bear. Then He looks forward to the events of the next day, and sees the mock trial, the scourging, the crowning with thorns, the Crucifixion! It was on His knees in Gethsemane that JESUS faced the Passion and

won the victory of "will." We see Him on Good Friday perfectly calm,—it was the calmness of conscious power.

We may think of Jacob of old at Peniel, wrestling with the Angel of GOD'S Presence, praying all night, saying, "I will not let thee go, except thou bless me," and winning not only the blessing but the name Israel, "the Prince of GOD;" "for," said the Angel, "as a prince hast thou power with GOD, and with men, and hast prevailed" (Gen. xxxii. 28)—prevailed, that is, by the power of prayer. So the true Jacob, our Lord, wrestles in Gethsemane and, in the joy of conscious power won by prayer, goes forth to the battlefield of Calvary.

2. Tabor.

How different is the other scene—Tabor, and the Transfiguration! Another cloud rolls over our Blessed Lord, not the cloud of sin but the Cloud of Glory, the manifestation of the HOLY GHOST. "And as He prayed, the fashion of His countenance was altered," His Face shone with the rays of Divine Light; His very raiment became "white and glistering." (S. Luke ix. 29). This glory was the natural result of the Hypostatic Union, which was ordinarily restrained by His own will, but was now allowed to blaze forth. The joy of communion with GOD in prayer in this dark world of sorrow is a foretaste of the glory and joy of Heaven. And the rays of brightness which lingered on our Lord when He came down from the mount, so that "the people, when they beheld Him, were greatly amazed" (S. Mark ix. 15), tell of the brightness of joy which is manifested in the appearance of those who live the life of prayer.

v. The structure of prayer.

It may be well to point out that structurally prayer generally falls into three divisions: (1) the Invocation,

(2) the Petition, and (3) the Plea or, as it is sometimes called, the Oblation.

1. The invocation.

All prayer must be addressed to GOD. Generally it is addressed to the First Person of the Holy Trinity, although sometimes to our Lord and to the HOLY GHOST.

In addressing GOD we add to His Holy Name some title or attribute which is intended to summon before our minds that aspect of the Divine Character which is contained in the title we utter. We use a significant word, which tells us something of GOD and is intended to flash into the mind a majestic image of GOD, and thus to help us to realize His Presence. And so we make an act of faith in that manifestation of His Character which is revealed in the title we have used.

Few parts of our prayers are generally more formal, more mechanical and unmeaning than the Invocation; and yet its importance can scarcely be over-estimated, since it is the very basis on which our prayers are founded. If we take as an example the Collect for Ash-Wednesday, we find the Invocation is, "Almighty and Everlasting GOD, Who hatest nothing that Thou hast made, and dost forgive the sins of all those who are penitent." Here, in addressing GOD we fix our mind on three of His attributes,—that He is Almighty, Everlasting, and Merciful. And it is on our belief in these attributes that we ground our prayer that He will "create and make in us new and contrite hearts"; for none but a GOD Who is Almighty and Merciful can do this. And by the word "Everlasting" we remember that His Eternity is one which knows no change; and that He is always ready to hear prayer, because always Almighty, always Merciful.

The Invocation in our prayer, therefore, may exhibit the merest formalism, or the most intense faith.

Under head of the "Petition" we group all that we need to ask of GOD in prayer; remembering that we must ask in a spirit of dependence, and of resignation to His Blessed Will. 2. The petition.

The only prevailing plea which we can offer is the Merits of CHRIST, and so all our prayers end with these words, "Through JESUS CHRIST our Lord," or their equivalent. This is sometimes called "the Oblation," since we offer our prayers through our Lord's Mediatorial Office. 3. The plea.

If our prayers are to be good prayers we must take care that no one of these three parts is merely formal. From the Invocation, which is the contemplation of the attributes of GOD, we must get, as it were, the inspiration of our prayer; from our own needs and miseries, the petition; and from our Lord's Merits the all-sufficient plea with our FATHER in Heaven.

The different kinds of prayer are sometimes classified under the heads of (1) Vocal, and (2) Mental Prayer. VI. The kinds of prayer.

Under vocal prayer would come what we mean by prayer in the ordinary usage of the word; that is, those prayers in which we express by word our needs to GOD. "In the evening, and at morning, and at noon-day will I pray, and that instantly." (Ps. lv. 18). Here the Psalmist teaches us that we should not be content with only morning and evening prayers, but that we should lift up our hearts to GOD at noon-day. And we should do so, even if we have time only for some brief collect, or the "Our FATHER." 1. Vocal prayer.

In prayer it is often very helpful to take some Psalm and paraphrase it, turning it, as it were, into our own words, or so altering it as to make it express the feelings of our heart. This is technically known as the "second method" of prayer, and is applicable not so much to our

regular morning and evening prayers as to occasions of special devotion.

Under this head, too, we should put our intercessions, those prayers for others which should find a place in our daily spiritual exercises.

In this class we place also the Services of the Church, the recitation of the Psalter, and other Offices, in which, while we utter GOD'S praise with the voice, the mind does not grasp the full significance of the words which are used. An Office is often said with a special intention, that is, the whole Office is offered to GOD as a prayer for some specific object.

2. Mental prayer.

Mental Prayer, or Meditation is that in which, while the voice is silent, the powers of the soul are active, listening for GOD'S Voice and communing with Him.*

VII. Distractions in prayer.

The greatest difficulty in prayer in the experience of almost every one is distraction of mind. This comes partly from the infirmity of our nature, and of course also from the direct assaults of the Devil, but much more from the results of past carelessness. It will help us to meet this constant trial if we remember that so far as it comes from the weakness of human nature it is not sin ; but that so far as it is the result of former habits of day-dreaming and dissipation of mind it is the penance of sin, and therefore to be borne cheerfully.

Distraction in prayer is often *remedial*, for the struggle to be recollected which it demands really helps us to win back the habit of concentration of thought which we had lost.

The Fathers and Doctors of the Church are unanimous in their teaching that if we come to our prayer

* This subject is so wide that the reader is referred to the author's *Helps to Meditation*, 2 vols. (Longmans), or the Instruction on Meditation, reprinted from the same book.

with a real desire to pray well, beginning therefore by carefully placing ourselves in GOD'S Presence, the involuntary distractions which annoy us (but which we try to resist) do not hinder the efficacy of the prayer. S. Thomas says that "he prays in spirit and in truth [that is acceptably] who from the leading of the SPIRIT approaches GOD in prayer, even though his mind from some infirmity afterwards wanders." And S. Augustine teaches us very much the same when he assures us that involuntary distractions will not take away from our prayer the fruit that is sought. S. Gregory likens the soul, when beset with distractions in prayer, to the patriarch Abraham driving away the birds of prey that came down upon the carcases which he had sacrificed to GOD. (Gen. xv. 11).

Conclusion.

Prayer is an inexhaustible subject, but here we can pursue it no further. It is hoped, however, that enough has been said to show that good prayer is essential to any real spiritual growth, and often depends upon a careful study of the nature and methods of prayer.

CHAPTER XX.

THE RULE OF LIFE.

Introductory.

AMONG the Saints probably no one man ever had so great and so general an influence over the thought and action of almost every class in his own day as S. Bernard. So frail a body and so frequent a sufferer from the results of his ascetic habits, S. Bernard's life seemed to be prolonged only by a continual miracle. In A.D. 1147, being then an old man and within six years of his death, he began his last great work, the preaching of the Second Crusade, when by the fire of his eloquence he persuaded all the chivalry of Europe to start for Jerusalem. They received the cross at his hands and set out for the Holy Land, with many a difficulty to be met on the way, and a fierce and powerful foe awaiting them at their journey's end.

S. Bernard preaching the Second Crusade.

Its parallel in Confirmation.

May we not find some parallel to this in the last instruction to a Confirmation class, when those who in Baptism were signed with the Cross in token that they should "not be ashamed to confess the Faith of CHRIST crucified and manfully to fight under His banner," are soon to have impressed upon them in the Sacrament of Confirmation the military character? Their arms, the Gifts of the HOLY SPIRIT, are given them; they publicly renew their vows, and, receiving in their first Communion the Esca Viatorum, start out

on their pilgrimage as soldiers of the Cross, with their faces steadfastly set to go up to Jerusalem.

Cause of failure.

But one thing more is needed—an itinerary, a set of rules for the pilgrimage. The Crusade which S. Bernard preached was the most disastrous of all, not from any fault of S. Bernard but largely from the want of discipline, degenerating even to licentiousness, among the soldiers of the Cross. Does not this remind us that of the many who are called, few are chosen? that of all those who take up the Cross of CHRIST and set their faces to go up to Jerusalem, many never reach the Heavenly City? And the cause is generally want of discipline, want of rules for guidance by the way.

I. Rule of Life.

It is fitting, therefore, that the last chapter of this book should be of the nature of an itinerary, or Rule of Life.

1. Importance of a rule.

Few people, probably, realize the great importance of rule in the spiritual life. Our life in the world could hardly go on without rule. In every department of business a well-arranged system is almost a necessary condition of success, and this implies a set of rules. And Our Blessed Lord spoke the parable of the Unjust Steward (S. Luke xvi. 1–9) to teach us to use in our spiritual affairs that practical wisdom which is so manifest in our dealings with the world.

i. To form habits.

The advantage of a rule of life is manifold. It helps us to form the habits which belong to the spiritual life. It has been said that as separate links go to make a chain, so separate acts gradually form a habit. If it be an evil habit it is indeed a chain which binds the sinner in a worse bondage than that of Egypt of old. If it be a good habit it is like a golden chain linking man to Heaven. The habit of prayer, one of the most valuable of all habits, is not formed by desultory efforts

to pray, but by setting aside a definite time daily for the exercises of prayer. And so it is with the formation of all spiritual habits; they are the result of many separate acts, of prolonged and systematic effort.

ii. To develop character.

The formation of habits leads to the development of character; for our character at any moment of our life is the resultant of all the forces for good and evil which have previously acted upon us. Intermittent forces leave little mark upon our character compared with the effects of the habits of our life. And the character which we form in this world will be either our glory in Heaven, or, like the poisoned tunic of Nessus, the cause of our agony forever in hell.

iii. To make life orderly.

Disorder has always more or less of the nature of sin. We can hardly think of a holy life which is not an orderly life. It has been said that "order is Heaven's first law," and certainly we cannot conceive of Heaven as a place of confusion and disorder.

Order is especially valuable in giving coherence and durability to work; for that which is done in a spasmodic, disorderly way has seldom much permanent effect. A disorderly life may be a very active life, but it will seldom be an effective life.

All this is as true of spiritual duties as of our work in the world. If our spiritual life is to be an effective life, it must be an orderly life; and nothing conduces more to order than a definite rule.

iv. To test progress.

Besides the advantages which we have noticed, a rule of life is a great help in self-examination, and a most real test of spiritual progress. If we have no rule we shall generally judge of our spiritual state simply by our feelings, which are often most misleading; and we shall be at one time unduly elated and at

another unnecessarily discouraged. If, on the other hand, we examine ourselves by our rule, we shall see clearly whether we are making progress or not; whether we are keeping our rule better than in the past, or are becoming more lax.

An illustration of the value of a rule.

It is told of a young girl who had been carefully prepared for Confirmation and First Communion in the school belonging to a religious house, that before going home she made and wrote down, by the advice of the priest, a simple rule of life. At first she kept it most faithfully, but after a while she became so engrossed in her new surroundings, so fascinated with the life of the world, that she gave up one by one each of the practices of her rule. For some years she lived a life of gaiety in the world with scarcely a thought of GOD; but as the novelty and excitement of this began to wear off, she realized how little such a life could satisfy the cravings of the soul. One day when turning over some old letters she found the envelope containing her rule of life. She opened it and read it, and her thoughts at once went back to that happy time when she had given herself to GOD, and experienced the joys of Communion with Him, and promised so solemnly to be true to Him. She went at once to the priest to make her confession, that she might begin again the life of holiness. Her rule showed how sadly she had fallen away from what she once had been; her rule told her exactly what to do to regain the lost ground. So our rule will always supply us with a fair test of our spiritual state.

2. Three characteristics of a good rule. i. Definiteness.

A good rule of life should always have three characteristics. It should be very *definite*. Resolutions to be "better" or "more earnest," while good in themselves, form no part of a rule of life. We should

simply state exactly in what way we determine to be better or more earnest.

ii. Generosity. In making our rule we should be *generous;* not putting down things which will cost us no effort whatever, but rather such duties as will develop in us the features of a Christlike life.

iii. Prudence. But while our rule should be generous, above all things it must be *prudent.* It would be most unwise to start with a burden of duties which we should find it practically impossible long to keep up. It is far better to begin with a very simple rule of life, and then perhaps each year to add something to it. This would ensure real progress in our spiritual life.

3. The matter of a rule of life. The rule of life may perhaps be best made under the Three Notable Duties of which our Lord speaks in the Sermon on the Mount,—Prayer, Almsgiving and Fasting.

i. Prayer. Under the head of Prayer we should include all our duty towards GOD, all the exercises of religion. These will fall into three classes,—(1) Private Prayer, (2) Public Prayer, and (3) Spiritual Reading.

(1) Private prayer. Under the first there will be the act of prayer by which we dedicate ourselves to GOD on awakening; then morning, evening, and noon-day prayer; meditation; self-examination (i) every night, (ii) before each Communion, and (iii) in preparation for Confession. And, the last thing at night, there will be the commendation of ourselves to GOD.

(2) Public prayer. Under the second head there will be the duty (i) of being present and assisting at the Holy Eucharist on every Sunday and Day of Obligation at the least, and at such other times as we find to be practicable; (ii) of making our Communion on the principal Feasts of the Church, and at such other times as our spiritual guide

counsels; and (iii) of making our confession at least before Easter, and as often as we find it helpful, or are advised by our confessor.

A most important help to a devout life is Spiritual reading. Here the Bible, of course, will come first, and should be read regularly, prayerfully, with real study, as a treasure-house from which to draw matter for meditation. Next to the Bible should come the lives of the Saints, which we should read not from mere curiosity but to draw from their examples precepts to help us in our own daily struggle. And then, too, we should read devotional books, such as "The Imitation of CHRIST," "The Spiritual Combat," "The Devout Life of the Soul." We should not read too large a portion of these books at one time, but rather use them as a garden from which to pluck a flower, some holy maxim or helpful thought, which may refresh us during the day by its fragrance and remind us of the garden from whence it came.

(3) Spiritual reading.

The second notable duty is Almsgiving. The Jews were directed by GOD to set apart one tenth of their substance for His service; and in chapter iii. of Malachi we learn that GOD punished neglect of this duty, as He rewarded abundantly its faithful performance. Under this head, too, we shall place our Church work, all works of mercy, all acts of kindness, whether done at home or abroad; and it may be well to remember that there is often more danger of neglecting acts of kindness in our *home* life than in our parochial or external work.

ii. Almsgiving.

The rich man in the parable (St. Luke xvi. 19–31) may have been quite a philanthropist, but there was a poor beggar at his own door, whom he passed by unheeded day after day as he went out to his work or

pleasure. And amongst ourselves there are many who give a large share of their time to Church work, but withhold the crumbs of kindness from individuals in their own households,—a sister or husband craving their sympathy and love, and like Lazarus wondering, as they starve, to see such devotion to Church work in those who are so selfish at home.

iii. Fasting. Under the third notable duty we find our duty to ourselves; for fasting includes all acts of discipline and self-denial by which body and soul are trained for the spiritual life. There will be, of course, the rule of Fasting Communion, and the Fasts appointed by our Church,—Ash-Wednesday and Good Friday; and, as Days of Abstinence, the Forty Days of Lent, the Ember Days, the Rogation Days, and all the Fridays in the year except Christmas Day.*

The value of the rule of fasting laid down by the Church is to be found not merely in the physical self-denial which it demands, but rather in the formation of habits of obedience to the laws of the Church which constitute the highest spiritual authority on earth. And therefore we should never without *serious* cause disobey the Church's law, but, if we need relaxation of the rule of fasting, seek a dispensation from our confessor or parish priest.

Besides physical fasting, it would be well for us to seek from time to time opportunities for the mortification of our will, and for self-denial in our pleasures.

Such will be the matter from which we must form our rule of life. Having carefully considered how much we are well able to do, we should write down our rule, and examine ourselves by it from time to time and always before each confession.

* In the English Prayer Book, *Vigils* also are placed among the Days of Fasting or Abstinence.

The purpose of a rule of life is, of course, to form in us habits of virtue and devotion. The three great virtues which we must keep always before us are (1) Humility, (2) Sincerity, and (3) Purity.

II. Cultivation of habits of virtue and devotion.

Humility must be the foundation of all spiritual life; for it is the realization of the truth about ourselves, and of the relation in which we stand to GOD. For this reason our Lord began the Beatitudes by saying, "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven." (S. Matt. v. 3).

1. Humility.

No virtue brings greater happiness than humility, for almost all care can be traced in some way or other to its opposite—pride. S. Peter says, "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of GOD, that He may exalt you in due time: casting all your care upon Him; for He careth for you." (1 S. Peter, v. 6, 7). Here the Apostle implies that it is only those who humble themselves who can cast their care upon GOD. Humility enables us to trust GOD in all things; while pride makes us distrustful, because self-confident. By far the larger part of our temptations, too, find their ally in the pride which is so deeply rooted in our nature;—not only those temptations which appeal directly to our pride, but those which seem to have no connection with it, though they are its immediate fruits. Such is very often the case in temptations to anger, impatience, and especially in untruthfulness and exaggeration.

Sincerity is closely allied to humility, as we learn by observing how often insincerity is the result of pride; and there is no sphere in which sincerity is more needed than in our religious life. Those who would be shocked at any insincerity in their dealings with their fellow-men, are often so self-deceived that they are entirely insincere in their attitude towards GOD. Our

2. Sincerity.

Blessed Lord has told us that "GOD is a spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth" (S. John iv. 24); that is, that our worship of GOD must be *sincere*, because GOD sees and knows not only what we do but the motive from which we do it.

If men could only realize this it would greatly change their religious life; for they would feel how useless and even foolish it is to offer to GOD a service which is only a mockery, because it proceeds from no right motive in the heart. No one who is sincere will be satisfied merely with wearing the garb of religion or using its phraseology, but will strive in all his religious acts to develop the character of the child and servant of GOD.

3. Purity. The last virtue we shall consider now is Purity. The ultimate end of religion is to train us for the Vision of GOD in Eternity, which is to be our exceeding great reward, our complete and unending happiness. But of this joy we may have some foretaste even in this world, if we cultivate the virtue of purity; for our Lord has said, "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see GOD." (S. Matt. v. 8).

This sight of GOD depends largely upon the purifying of the atmosphere of our life, through which we see GOD; for our view of all things is affected by the atmosphere through which they are seen. We notice how changed the sun looks at different times, sometimes even like a red ball of fire; and yet we know that the sun is always the same, and that the apparent difference is caused by change in the atmosphere through which we see it.

This enables us to account for the strange, distorted views which some men have of GOD; since a man's idea of GOD largely depends upon his own character. The Psalmist says of GOD: "With the holy

Thou shalt be holy; and with a perfect man Thou shalt be perfect. With the clean Thou shalt be clean; and with the froward Thou shalt learn [or show] frowardness." (Ps. xviii. 25, 26). If, then, we are to see GOD in this life; realizing His absolute holiness we must cultivate the virtue of purity, not only in word and act but also, and especially, in thought. "Blessed are the pure in *heart:* for they shall see GOD."

The purifying, then, of the atmosphere of our life will mean prompt and vigorous resistance to all temptations against this virtue, and an openly expressed disapproval of the immorality of the day. It will involve a disciplining of that curiosity of mind which makes us desire to know *everything*, to know good *and evil*. It was in the attempt to gratify this passion that Eve fell so sadly. And it is through undisciplined reading that many a heart loses its purity. All theatrical plays which gain their interest from an appeal to the lower passions will be avoided. And those who have openly broken the laws of GOD and His Church through the aid of the Divorce Court will be shunned at all costs.

The reward of this purity is twofold: (1) a peace of soul, the result of freedom from sin, which is in itself a joy; and (2) a habit of recollection which will be our best safeguard in all attacks of temptation, and which will make our prayers and spiritual exercises a means of real communion with GOD, a foretaste of the communion of Heaven.

Conclusion.

We began this book with a story of the childhood of S. Thomas Aquinas. Let us end it with one that belongs to the close of his life. When he was a child his constant question was, *Quid est Deus?*—"What is GOD?" His life was spent in the endeavour to

answer this question, not only theoretically but practically—in the effort not merely to know *about* GOD through the study of theology, but to know Him also in the closest intercourse of spiritual life. Of all theologians probably none has written so well or so fully of GOD as S. Thomas Aquinas.

The vision of S. Thomas.

It is recorded that shortly before his death, when he was penning the last part of his "Summa," the part which treats of the Sacrament of Penance, he was praying one day at Naples in a Chapel dedicated to S. Nicholas, before a certain figure of our Lord hanging on the Cross; and Christ's voice was heard saying from the image, "Thomas, thou hast written well of Me; what reward desirest thou for thy labour?" "*Domine, non nisi Te*"—"Nothing but Thyself, LORD!"—was the Saint's reply.*

And if during our preparation for Confirmation we have been studying theology in his spirit, that we may know GOD; we too may ask no less reward than that which S. Thomas asked, not GOD'S gifts, but GOD Himself; and that reward we shall receive in our first Communion, in which are received both the gifts and the Giver.

Blosius' description of two sorts of servants of GOD.

GOD has two sorts of servants, says Blosius, those who serve Him for His gifts, and those who serve Him for Himself. The first seek only sensible sweetness in devotion, and when this is taken away, are discouraged and give up GOD'S service. The second serve Him for Himself, and when He withdraws His gifts, only press on more earnestly to Him; for they rest not in the gifts, but in the Giver.

* Thoma, bene scripsisti de Me: quam recipies a Me pro tuo labore mercedem? Domine, non nisi Te. *Tocco, cap. vi. Boll. Martii 7, p. 669.*

In this spirit, then, let us live our life on earth, tasting often the sweetness of GOD'S gifts, thanking Him with all our heart for them,—but not allowing ourselves to be discouraged if for a while He withdraws them,—and taking for our motto, "*Domine, non nisi Te!*" Nothing but Thyself, Lord, here; nothing but Thyself for ever hereafter! The motto of our life.

APPENDIX.

ON THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

Introductory

The Tractarians in treating of the Eucharistic Sacrifice appeal (1) to the Fathers and (2) to the Anglican Divines.

They formulate no theory of the mode of this sacrifice.

IN the revival of Catholic truth in this century which began with the Oxford movement, we find that the Tractarians, when treating of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, appeal first to the Fathers and then to the great Anglican Divines, especially to those of the seventeenth century. They make little attempt to formulate a theory which shall explain the *manner* in which the Eucharist is a sacrifice, but content themselves with asserting the *fact* that it is a sacrifice, and prove it by bringing forward passages from the Fathers and from Anglican writers.

(1) Catenæ from the Fathers are found in the writings of Keble, Forbes, and Pusey.

The catenæ of passages which they collected from the Fathers are to be found in Keble's *Considerations Suggested by a Late Pastoral Letter on the Doctrine of the Most Holy Eucharist*, in the Bishop of Brechin's *Primary Charge*, in his *Theological Defence*, and in his work on *The Thirty-nine Articles*. We learn from Liddon's *Life of Dr. Pusey* that the *Theological Defence* and *The Thirty-nine Articles* were written with the assistance of Dr. Pusey, and so may certainly be considered as representing his views. In both these works we are cautioned that the term "sacrifice" (except when referred to the Cross) is employed only in its *passive* sense, and in the *Theological Defence* we are told

The term "sacrifice" is used in a passive sense.

that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is substantially (*quoad substantiam*) identical with that of the Cross, since in it is present the same Victim, "the Lamb of GOD."

(2) The catena from the Anglican Divines is given in Tract 81.

The catena from the Anglican Divines of passages relating to the Eucharistic Sacrifice is found in Tract No. 81 of the *Tracts for the Times;* this was written by Dr. Pusey in the year 1838.

I. Theories of fifty years ago. The Roman doctrine of sacrifice. Two schools:

Fifty years ago, an examination of the subject would have shown that the doctrine taught by the great majority of Roman theologians was founded on S. Thomas' well-known definition of sacrifice in general: "Sacrifices are properly so called when something is done to things offered to GOD, as that when [by the Jews] animals were slain and [now] bread is broken and eaten and blessed, and this the word itself signifies, for sacrifice is so named from the fact that man makes something sacred" (*Summa, 2a 2ae*, q. lxxxv., a. 3, ad. 3). In this definition, S. Thomas introduces into the idea of sacrifice an element not before recognized. When he speaks of "animals" being "slain" and "bread broken and eaten," he seems to require such a change in the victim as is equivalent to its destruction, and this theory, which is found first in S. Thomas, has influenced the view of the majority of Roman theologians down to the present day. It reached its fullest development under De Lugo (ob. 1660), and is most ably represented in our times by Franzelin. It may be observed, however, that S. Thomas, in treating of the Sacrifice of the Mass, does not refer to this definition, which is found in his discussion of sacrifice in general.

That of De Lugo, requiring the destruction of the victim in sacrifice,

and the more moderate school, which

Side by side with this view, however, there has always been a more moderate school, represented in the sixteenth century by Salmeron (ob. 1585) and Vasquez

(ob. 1604), and in the present day by the school of Scheeben and Schanz in Germany, Lepin and Fixeront in France, and Tyrrell in England, who teach that in the Eucharist there is only a mystical immolation; that it is a sacrifice, not absolutely, but only as dependent upon the Sacrifice of the Cross, of which it is the representation and commemoration. With this school, the Anglican Divines and Tractarians would probably have been in practical accord.

teaches only a mystical immolation in the Sacrifice of the Mass.

If we now turn from the Roman Church to our own, we find that fifty years ago the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice set forth by the Tractarians was a doctrine which they had learned from the Fathers, somewhat coloured and modified (probably unintentionally) by certain views acquired from Anglican writers.

The Tractarian view at the same period was drawn from the Fathers, but coloured by Anglican theories.

The Fathers of the first six centuries clearly teach that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. Their view of it, however, is synthetic, not analytic. They consider the Eucharist, as a "whole," as the Church's sacrifice, and as substantially identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross. They make no attempt to analyze this conception or to formulate any theory in regard to the *mode* in which it is a sacrifice. They dwell especially on the identity of the Priest and Victim in the sacrifices of the Eucharist and of the Cross, so that, for them, our LORD is, in a *passive* sense, always the Sacrifice, since He is the "Lamb of GOD." They also speak of Him in His Human Nature, at the "Right Hand of GOD," as the Altar upon which all the prayers and sacrifices of the Church are presented.

The view of the Fathers.

The Tractarian view, however, is coloured by the teachings of a few Anglican writers, who relate the Eucharist as a Sacrifice directly to our LORD'S Media-

The influence of Anglican writers.

torial work, which they represent as the pleading of His Passion in Heaven. There is not the slightest trace of any such doctrine in the Fathers, nor, we believe, is it really to be found in any writer earlier than the sixteenth century. A mystical analogy between the Eucharist and our LORD'S Intercession in Heaven is found in some Liturgical writers of the twelfth century.* They, however, not only carefully avoid ascribing its sacrificial character to its connection with our LORD'S Mediatorial work, but distinctly affirm that this depends on its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross. The first who related the Eucharist, "not so much to the Oblation once for all made upon the Cross . . . as to the perpetual Priesthood and continual Sacrifice which the eternal Priest offers daily in the heavens,"† was Georgius Cassander (ob. 1566); Thomas Watson, the Marian Bishop of Lincoln, in 1558, while writing of the Eucharist as one with our LORD'S action in Heaven, does not make the sacrificial essence to depend upon this identity, but asserts that in it our LORD'S Passion and Death are represented and renewed before GOD.‡ Bishop Overall (ob. 1619) seems to have taken his view almost verbatim from Cassander§ and introduced it to the English Church. Bishop Jeremy Taylor, though expressing it more guardedly, probably obtained it from the same source. It formed the basis of Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice*, and through these writers made its way, *in a modified form*, into the works of other Anglican Divines, and seems to have in-

* *E. g.* S. Ivo of Chartres, V. Hildebert of Mans, Hugo of S. Victor.

† *Cassandri Consultatio de Sacrificio*, p. 999.

‡ From the Bodleian copy of Bishop Watson's Works, folio 70.

§ *Cassandri Opera, Consultatio: de Sacrificio*, pp. 998, 999.

fluenced, though only in a slight degree, the teachings of the Tractarians.

II. Modifications of these views since 1870. New currents both in the Roman and Anglican Communions.

Since the year 1870, new currents have gradually set in, both in the Roman and Anglican Communions. In Germany, two schools have appeared, the more radical, that of Thalhofer, the more orthodox, that of Scheeben and Schanz. The latter may be considered in some sense as the followers of Salmeron, Vasquez, and Suarez.

1. In the Roman Church.

i. Thalhofer's theory.

In 1870, Dr. Valentine Thalhofer published his work, *Das Opfer des alten und des neuen Bundes*, in which, while recognizing in the oblation of our LORD upon the Cross a "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice," and finding the essentially sacrificial act in the shedding of His "Precious Blood," he sought to establish a heavenly sacrifice, like the Eucharist dependent upon the Sacrifice of the Cross. He considers this heavenly sacrifice to be our LORD'S Mediatorial work, which he regards as CHRIST'S pleading His Passion in Heaven. In his later work, *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, the first volume of which appeared in 1889 and a new edition in 1894, he attempts to substantiate this view by quotations from the Fathers and mediæval writers, and says: "In consideration of these citations, we are indeed justified in affirming that the acceptance of a heavenly sacrifice was, in a way, an idea not foreign to the Fathers, or to the theologians of the middle ages and later: although it must be confessed that precise, accurately formulated views of the same are not definitely to be found in their works. Since theologians differ, and have differed, in their views of the actual nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, we need not be surprised at not meeting with any crystallized, scholastic theory concerning the heavenly sacrifice. Whoever has once

granted that the High-Priestly Intercession of CHRIST in heaven is not only a vocal pleading, but a mediating act, an actual presentation of the work of salvation completed upon the Cross, has thereby conceded in reality the existence of the heavenly sacrifice, even if he expresses himself clearly as against the idea of such a sacrifice." *

In this statement of Dr. Thalhofer, we may observe :

(1) That he holds perfectly orthodox views in regard to our LORD'S sacrifice on the Cross, for he speaks of "the work of salvation completed upon the Cross."

(2) He assumes that a heavenly sacrifice is implied in our LORD'S Mediatorial work, which assumption is entirely foreign to the Fathers and great theologians of the Church.

(3) He admits that there are no precise passages to be found in any of their writings, but he makes the remarkable assertion that "even if a theologian expresses himself clearly as against the idea of such a heavenly sacrifice, he is to be considered as conceding the reality of its existence, if he grants that the High-Priestly Intercession of our LORD is a mediating act." † This is, of course, a mere begging of the question and would not be granted by any theologian outside of Thalhofer's school.

Thalhofer has several followers in Germany, the most distinguished of whom is Dr. Franz, who sets forth a similar view in the second part of his well-known work, *Die Eucharistische Wandlung und die Epiklese der*

* Thalhofer, *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, ed. 1894, p. 229.

† Thalhofer's view is fully treated and all his authorities examined in the author's *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*, Chapters VIII. and IX.

Griechischen und Orientalischen Liturgien. The arguments of this school have been very fully answered by F. A. Stentrup, S. J., in his *Prælectiones Dogmaticæ, Soteriologia*, Vol. II.

ii. The school of Scheeben and Schanz.

The whole question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice has been treated with great learning by Scheeben in his *Dogmatik*, and by Schanz in his *Die Lehre von den heiligen Sacramenten*. These authors represent a new school (to some extent, perhaps, the revival of an older school), for they have ventured to shake themselves free from that traditional view of sacrifice which has done so much to invalidate modern Roman treatises on this doctrine, and, while remaining perfectly orthodox on all points, they have given us a definition and treatment of sacrifice which promises to be largely accepted among theologians and to form the basis of even fuller investigations of this most interesting subject.

2. Three schools in the English Church to-day.

If we examine now the teachings of our own Church in the present day in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, we shall find three schools.

i. The Tractarian.

i. There are those who retain the Tractarian or Patristic position, who teach that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, but make little attempt to set forth any theory which shall explain in what manner it is a sacrifice. Like the Fathers, they speak of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist as identical with that of the Cross, since in both are the same Priest and the same Victim. They relate this Sacrifice also in a passive sense to our LORD'S Mediatorial work in Heaven, for, as they point out, our LORD is there upon the throne, "the Lamb as it had been slain," the Eternal Sacrifice.

ii. The Catholic.

ii. There are those (the Catholic school) who go a step farther, and, while accepting this view wholly and unreservedly, add to it an investigation of the

essentially sacrificial act in the Eucharist. These would probably express their belief in the words of Bossuet, which Dr. Pusey quotes with apparent approval in his *Eirenicon*,* and to which Archbishop Wake refers in the following passage: "Monsieur de Meaux has represented it to us with so much tenderness, that, except perhaps it be his foundation of the corporeal presence, on which he builds, and his consequence, that this service is a true and real propitiatory Sacrifice, which his manner of expounding it we are persuaded will never bear, there is little in it besides, but what we could readily assent to." † This definition of Bossuet is practically the teaching of the school of Scheeben and Schanz.‡ Bossuet's words are as follows:

Bossuet's definition.

"The essence of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist consists precisely in the Consecration, whereby, in virtue of the words of JESUS CHRIST, His Body and Precious Blood are placed really on the holy Table, mystically separated under the species of bread and wine. By this action taken precisely, and without anything added by the priest, JESUS CHRIST is really offered to His FATHER, inasmuch as His Body and His Blood are placed before Him, actually clothed with the signs representing His Death.

The essence of the S. is in the Consecration;

"As this consecration is done in the Name, in the Person, and through the words of JESUS CHRIST, it is

CHRIST both consecrates and offers;

* Pusey's *Eirenicon*, Part III., page 44 sqq.

† *Tracts of the Times*, No. 81, p. 308.

‡ In a letter to the author, Dr. Schanz recognizes Bossuet and the French Oratorian school of the seventeenth century as holding his view. He writes: "Denique addo, notionem sacrificii, quam Scheeben, Schanz et alii statuunt, a plerisque oppugnari. Singuli quidem nuperrime eam suam fecerunt, ex. gr. Lepin . . . citat Berulle Thomassinum et *Bossuet* tanquam antecessores huic notioni consentientes."

He in truth Who both consecrates and offers, and the priests are only simple ministers. . . . priests are only His ministers;

"It appears that this real oblation of the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST is a consequence of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and that the Church is not to be asked to produce any other commission to 'offer' than that which is given her to consecrate, since the oblation in its essence consists in the Consecration itself. . . . the S. is a consequence of the Real Presence;

"We believe that this action, whereby the SON of GOD is placed upon the holy Table under signs representative of His Death, viz., the Consecration, carries with it the recognition of the high sovereignty of GOD, in that JESUS CHRIST, present, renews in it the memory of His obedience even to the Death of the Cross, and in some sort perpetuates it. in it is renewed the Death upon the Cross;

"We believe, also, that this same action makes GOD propitious to us, because it sets before His eyes the voluntary Death of His SON for sinners, or rather His SON clothed, as was said, with the signs representative of that Death whereby He had been appeased. and this makes GOD propitious to us;

"On this ground we say that JESUS CHRIST still offers Himself in the Eucharist; for having once given Himself for us to be our Victim, He does not cease to present Himself to His FATHER, as the Apostle says that 'He appears before GOD for us.' . . .

"We believe, then, that His Presence on the holy Altar, in this figure of death, is a continual oblation which He makes of Himself, of His Death and His merits, for the human race. . . .

"It is not good reasoning to say that the Oblation of the Cross is not sufficient, supposing that JESUS CHRIST still offers Himself in the Eucharist, any more than it would be to say that, because He continues to intercede for us in Heaven, His Intercession on the this S. does not take away from the sufficiency of that upon the Cross;

in the H. E. we apply the merits of the Cross;

Cross was imperfect and insufficient for our salvation. . . .

"We know that the whole merit of our Redemption is in such wise attached to this great Sacrifice of the Cross that there is nothing left for us to do in that of the Eucharist but to celebrate its memory and to apply to us its virtue.

there is no destruction of the Victim;

"Moreover, let us not think that the Victim, which we present in the Eucharist, is to be there in truth anew destroyed; because the SON of GOD has once most abundantly satisfied this obligation by the Sacrifice of the Cross, as S. Paul the Apostle proves divinely in his Epistle to the Hebrews; in such wise that, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist being established in commemoration, we ought to seek therein only a mystical death and destruction, wherein the effectual Death which the SON of GOD once suffered for us is represented.

the H. E., while a proper S., depends entirely upon the S. of the Cross.

"Such is the Sacrifice of the Church, a spiritual sacrifice, where the Blood is shed in mystery only, where death intervenes only in mystery; still a very true sacrifice, in that JESUS CHRIST, Who is the Victim, is really contained there under this figure of death; but a commemorative sacrifice, which *subsists only through its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross*, and derives therein all its virtue." *

iii. The Modern school.

(iii.) The third school, while *claiming* to be in accord with the Tractarians, base their theory upon a doctrine of our LORD'S Sacrifice, which would be, and indeed was, repudiated by the great Tractarian writers. The foundation of their position is an interpretation of

* This translation is taken from Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*. The passage is in tom. vi., pp. 116–118, of Bossuet, *Œuvres complètes*, 12 vols., Tours, 1862.

the Epistle to the Hebrews which was first put forth by Socinus as the very kernel of his system of Christology. He held that the only Jewish sacrifice which really typified the Sacrifice of CHRIST was the annual sacrifice upon the great day of Atonement when the high priest entered the Holy of holies. Socinus points out that, while in the Jewish sacrifice there were several stages, the essentially sacrificial act was the presentation of the blood of the victim by the priest. The mactation, which in some cases was performed by laymen, he held to be only an introductory rite, necessary for the purpose of obtaining the blood, but not really an essential part of the sacrifice.

It is founded upon the Socinian interpretation of Hebrews,

So far, the statements of Socinus are, of course, not without truth, but the conclusions which he deduces from them are quite incompatible with the teachings of every part of the Christian Church in regard to our LORD'S Atonement, for he asserts that, just as on the Day of Atonement the victim was slain in the usual place, but the high priest carried the blood of the bullock and the goat within the Holy of holies and sprinkled the Mercy-Seat, so our LORD was put to death upon the Cross, but after His Ascension entered the true Holy of holies, heaven itself, and there presented His Precious Blood, and by this act offered the Sacrifice which redeemed man. Socinus denies that our LORD'S Death upon the Cross was in any sense a sacrifice or that He was then a Priest. The Sacrifice and Priesthood he limits entirely to Heaven. The Death upon the Cross he calls a martyrdom for truth, nothing more, and he teaches that only after our LORD'S Ascension did His Priesthood begin and was His Sacrifice offered.

which denies the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement.

This doctrine of Socinus is practically the basis of

The Modern view as stated by Mr. Brightman.

the theory of the Modern school in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice; for they teach that "the slaying of the victim is the initial act and one moment in a process which included many subsequent acts and that the object of the Epistle to the Hebrews is largely to show that whereas that [initial] act in our LORD'S Sacrifice was fulfilled when He died once for all upon the Cross, He has passed into the heavens and is the Minister of the true Tabernacle, to fulfil perpetually the other acts of His sacrifice, which the slaying of the victim made possible." * This is precisely the view of Socinus, only that some of the Modern school would extend our LORD'S Priesthood to His Death on the Cross, that is, to what they call the initial act of His Sacrifice, but, as they rightly make the presentation of the Blood to be the essentially sacrificial action, and place this after our LORD'S Ascension into Heaven, they really deny that our LORD "upon the Cross for our redemption . . . made . . . by His one Oblation of Himself, once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice." Having thus established (to their own satisfaction) a sacrifice in Heaven absolutely unknown to the Fathers or indeed to any other writer earlier than Lælius Socinus, a sacrifice which detracts from the completeness and sufficiency of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and is, therefore, subversive of the teaching of our Prayer-Book and Articles, they proceed to relate the Eucharistic Sacrifice to this sacrifice which our LORD is supposed to be offering in Heaven. They interpret "the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the reproduction on earth, not of the moment of the Cross but of our LORD'S perpetual action in Heaven." They deny that in the words of Institution, "Do this in remembrance of

* Brightman, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*, pp. 4 and 5.

Me," there is anything "which suggests special reference to our LORD'S Death." They consider "the mark of death on the Eucharist to be analogous, not to its place . . . in His history at the moment of the Cross, but to its place in His glorified Person." They teach that "the assumption that the Eucharist is directly related to our LORD'S offering of Himself on the Cross as pre-eminently and exclusively the memorial of His death, the commemoration of His Passion . . . in its most exaggerated expression is familiar to us all [in certain popular teaching, but that] in a less exaggerated form *it is prominent in our own formulæ*." It is scarcely necessary to point out that these views are absolutely contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church, whether we seek its expression in the Anglican, Greek, or Roman formulæ, and indeed to the words of St. Paul himself, who says, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me, for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the LORD'S death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 25, 26).

We find these views, generally, though not always, associated with certain theories in regard to our LORD'S "kenosis," which, in setting forth that at His Incarnation He laid aside His attributes of Omnipotence, Omniscience, etc., practically destroy His Divinity, since GOD'S attributes are an essential part of GOD'S Nature, and GOD cannot part with them without ceasing to be what He was before, GOD.

This school, according to the announcements of some of its most distinguished representatives, aims at restating the doctrines of the Church so as to bring them into accord with the thought of the nineteenth century. We have always supposed that the duty, and therefore the aim, of every theologian was to educate the thought

of the age in accordance with the unchanging doctrines of the Church, not to accommodate the Church's teaching to the transient speculations of the day. We cannot, therefore, wonder that, with such a purpose before them, even the most distinguished scholars should fall into grievous error. As we have said, the interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, upon which this Modern theory is based, originated with Socinus. No traces of it are to be found in any commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrews (or indeed in any writer) earlier than Socinus. It is rejected in every Catholic commentary to-day. Bishop Westcott says of it: "The modern conception of CHRIST'S pleading in Heaven His Passion, offering His Blood, on behalf of men is not found in the Epistle. His glorified Humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as older writers truly expressed the thought, by His presence on the Father's Throne. Meanwhile men on earth in union with Him enjoy continually through His Blood what was before the privilege of one man on one day in the year;" * and again: "The modern conception of CHRIST'S pleading His Passion in Heaven . . . is, as far as I know, not found in the Fathers." †

This view unknown to ancient and rejected by all (Catholic) modern commentators on Hebrews.

The Modern view must carefully be distinguished from that taught by the Tractarians. They held that in a *passive sense* only our LORD was the Sacrifice in Heaven and in the Eucharist, and in this sense they related the Eucharistic Sacrifice to our LORD upon His Throne in Heaven, but they taught that it was the memorial of the Cross and that neither in Heaven nor in the Eucharist was anything added to the completeness of the

It is to be distinguished from the Tractarian teaching.

*Westcott on Hebrews, p. 230.

† From a letter of the Bishop of Durham to the author.

Sacrifice which was finished upon Calvary. Dr. Pusey says that the Atonement "was once for all finished on the Cross," that it was "ended as *an act*," but that its effects live on in our LORD'S abiding Intercession.* Mr. Keble says: "The day of Calvary can never come again: CHRIST hanging on the Cross was a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."† The Bishop of Brechin in his *Primary Charge* says: "There, on that Cross of Shame, 'He made that full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.' That Sacrifice to which all faith looked on, representing and pleading it to GOD, before CHRIST came; which our LORD pleads now; to which all Eucharists and all prayers to GOD now look back and plead, was, as an Atonement, *complete in itself.* It alone was an Atonement; it alone was a Satisfaction for sin; it alone was meritorious. Our dear LORD, in the bright Majesty of His Mediatorial Throne, invested with all power in heaven and in earth, adored by the cherubim and seraphim and by all the company of Heaven, clothed with that Body which was pierced for us, and ever exhibiting, for us sinners, to His FATHER, those wounded Hands and Feet and Side, has vouchsafed to limit Himself; He adds nothing now to that One Sacrifice which He made when He died upon the Cross, inasmuch as nothing could be added."‡ Again, in his *Theological Defence*, which, together with his work on *The Thirty-nine Articles*, was written with the assistance of Dr. Pusey, Bishop Forbes says: "This single Sacrifice on the Cross is universal and

As set forth by Dr. Pusey,

Mr. Keble,

and Bishop Forbes.

* Pusey, *University Sermons*, pp. 96 and 98.

† Keble, *Sermons for the Christian Year*, vol. iv., p. 390.

‡ Forbes, *Primary Charge*, p. 49.

all-powerful. This alone is meritorious. To it CHRIST Himself in His Eternal Intercession addeth nothing. . . . Briefly, then, I hold and confess, that the Holy Communion is *actively* the commemoration of the most precious Death and Sacrifice of JESUS CHRIST; but all this is perfectly compatible with the belief that *passively* the Sacrifice, *i. e.*, that which is offered and presented to Almighty GOD, is the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST, and therefore, in virtue of the hypostatic union, JESUS CHRIST Himself."* And yet again, in his work on *The Thirty-nine Articles*, he says: "One common argument against the Eucharistic Sacrifice is that, according to this belief, one must hold and teach the *blasphemy* . . . that CHRIST'S offering on the Cross was not the alone satisfaction for sin; that one must deny that the Oblation of CHRIST was finished upon the Cross." †

From these statements of Mr. Keble, Dr. Pusey, and the Bishop of Brechin, we may see how absolutely unfounded is the claim of the Modern school to represent the teaching of the Tractarians. Indeed, the Tractarians would have indignantly rejected the doctrine on which the Modern school bases its view of the relation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice to our LORD'S action in Heaven, namely, that the essentially sacrificial act in our LORD'S Oblation was accomplished, not on the Cross but in Heaven, and, therefore, that though the initial act of the Sacrifice took place upon the Cross yet, inasmuch as it was only an initial act, the Sacrifice was incomplete and unfinished.

It is quite impossible within the limits of an Appendix adequately to treat this most interesting question,

* Forbes, *Theological Defence*, p. 16.

† Forbes, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 614.

the investigation of which leads us into many fields; for evidence must be gathered, not only from Holy Scripture, but from the ancient Liturgies, the Fathers, the mediæval theologians, post-mediæval writers (especially from the school of the French Oratory), and the Anglican Divines. There is to be considered, besides, the continuous witness of the Greek Church and the recent contributions of the French and German schools, to which we have already referred.* We can only say here most emphatically that the Modern view is to be rejected as impugning the doctrine of the Atonement set forth by the Catholic Church, and especially in the Prayer-Book of the Church of England, as heretical in its origin, and most dangerous in its tendencies.

III. The many departments of theology which throw light on this subject.

The theological aspect of the subject may be summed up in the following propositions, † which are arranged under three heads: 1. What must be denied as heretical; 2. What must be admitted as permissible; and 3. What must be affirmed as necessary.

The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice may be summed up in ten theological propositions;

1. Propositions which must be denied as conflicting with some doctrine of the Catholic Faith:

four propositions must be denied as conflicting with the Catholic Faith;

i. It must be denied that in any sense the Sacrifice of the Cross was imperfect or unfinished, or that by anything our LORD does now in His Mediatorial office, He adds anything to the fulness and sufficiency of the Sacrifice which He offered once for all and finished upon the Cross.

ii. It must be denied that the Sacrifice of the Altar consists in aught else than the "doing" of that which

* The reader will find in the author's *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* a collection of the most important passages from all these various sources, besides a full discussion of the whole subject.

† These propositions are taken from Chapter XII. of the author's *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*.

our LORD Himself did and commanded His Apostles to continue, namely, the taking of bread and the consecrating it into His Body, the taking of wine in the cup and the consecrating it into His Blood. Hence it must be denied that this consecration of the Body and Blood of the LORD under diverse species, as severed by death, has any counterpart in our LORD'S Mediatorial work in Heaven; and it must be affirmed that it finds its only counterpart in His Sacrifice on the Cross.

iii. It must be denied that the mere presence of a once-sacrificed Victim is a proper sacrifice, that is, in the active sense of the word. Our LORD'S glorified Humanity, sitting at the Right Hand of the FATHER and now appearing in the Presence of GOD for us, may be analogous to His Presence in the Reserved Sacrament, but not to the act of Consecration, which is the act of sacrifice.

iv. It must therefore be denied that in the proper sense our LORD offers any sacrifice in Heaven, or that He there exercises that function of His Priesthood.* For revelation assures us that He has committed to the priesthood on earth the ministry of reconciliation,† through which priesthood, and in the Church on earth alone, He actively offers sacrifice.‡

three admitted as consistent with it;

2. Propositions which must be admitted as entirely consistent with the Catholic Faith:

i. It must be admitted that in a mystical and very true sense, there is an altar in Heaven, from which rise up before the Almighty TRINITY all the prayers, alms, and sacrifices of the whole Church, Militant, Expectant,

* S. Chrys. in Heb. *Hom.*, xiii., 3; Euthym. Zig. in Heb., cap. vii., v. 27.

† 2 Cor. v. 18–20.

‡ Theodoret in *Psalm* cix. 4.

and Triumphant. Most of the Fathers consider this Altar to be our LORD'S Sacred Humanity.

ii. It must be admitted that, since the Presence of the Sacred Humanity always pleads for us with the Divine Majesty, our LORD may be properly in mystery styled a perpetual Oblation, and that in this sense there is in Heaven now a perpetual Oblation.

iii. It must be admitted, too, that our LORD is a Sacrifice in Heaven, since He is the Lamb which was once offered in sacrifice for us. And in this sense, using the word "sacrifice" as the equivalent of "victim," it must be admitted that there is now, and that there will be *through all eternity*, a Sacrifice in Heaven.

three affirmed as necessarily comprised in, and set forth by, the Anglican formularies.

3. Propositions which must be affirmed as necessarily comprised in the Catholic Faith and as clearly set forth in the formularies of the Church of England:

i. It must be affirmed that on the Cross our LORD offered once for all a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, and that to this Sacrifice nothing can ever be added, by Him or by any one else. And further, that this Sacrifice was sufficient and superabundant as a satisfaction for all the sins of men, both original and actual.

ii. It must be affirmed that the Sacrifice of the Altar is a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, not absolute, nor possessing any power in itself alone, but deriving all its efficacy from its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, of which it is the perpetual memorial (*ἀνάμνησις*) and application.

iii. It must be affirmed that while in connection with the offering of this Sacrifice a grateful memory is made of all the mysteries of the LORD'S Life; and in a symbolical way, gifts like those of Abel and Melchisedec are offered and presented, and intercessions are made

in union with our LORD's great Mediatorial work; yet all these are mere accidental accompaniments of the Divine Sacrifice, and not its essential part, which consists, as we have said, only in doing that which the LORD did, and which He commanded us to do when He instituted this Sacrament.

Conclusion.

In making these affirmations and denials, we believe that we are not following any particular school, or accepting the opinions of any individual teachers, whether ancient or modern; but that we are simply following the express words of Divine revelation as interpreted by the Church in all ages, alike by its Liturgies, its Fathers, and its theologians. And therefore we affirm that this is the only doctrine which can be held by us with loyalty to the principles of the Church of England.

INDEX.

A.

Absolute power of GOD, 10.
Absolution, forms of: declaratory at Matins and Evensong, 167; precatory in the Liturgy, 167; judicial in the Sacrament of Penance, 169; the precatory form sufficient, 169; history of forms in the Liturgy, 171; one of the benefits of Sacramental Confession, 195.
Accompanying grace, 120.
Actual grace, 118.
Actual sin, 175.
Adam, his trial, 36; knowledge, 37; temptation, 37–39; restricted only by intellectual discipline, 38; consequences of his sin, 39; chief result of his sin, discord in man's nature, 40.
Adoration at the Eucharist a duty, 229; an expression of love, 229.
Adults, unbaptized, 132, 134.
Affections, the, acted upon by Communion, 252, 255.
Alb, 278.
Algerus, view of the doctrine of transubstantiation, 228.
Almsgiving, part of the rule of life, 305.
Altar, 276.
Altar-cloths, 277.
Amice, 278.
Anaphora, 272.
Angels, definition, 25; have they bodies? 26; knowledge intuitive, 26; number and functions—the Nine Choirs, 26; functions of the different Choirs, 27; First Hierarchy: Seraphim, 27; Cherubim, 27; Thrones, 28; Second Hierarchy: Dominions, 28; Principalities, 28; Powers, 28; Third Hierarchy: Virtues, 28; Archangels, 29; Angels, 29; through Angels GOD works mediately, 29; Guardian Angels, 29; in what state were the Angels created? 29; their trial, 30; in what it consisted, 30; three views of Lucifer's sin: that he desired to be a GOD, 30; to be a sovereign, 30; to be the instrument of the Incarnation, 31; result of the sin of the angels, 31; Holy Angels admitted to the Vision of GOD, 31; could the fallen angels repent? 31; some from each Order fell, 32; man created to fill their places, 32, 33; the malice of the fallen angels wrecked the primeval earth, 24, 33; power of Angels to assume a material body, 224; example of the Angel with Tobit, 224; with Abraham, 225.

Anglican form of Confirmation, 146.
Antecedent Will of GOD in creation, 49.
Apollinarianism refuted by the Council of Constantinople, 56.
Apostolic Succession, 86; Liturgy, 271; Constitutions, 272.
Archangels, 29.
Architecture of Churches symbolical, 275.
Arianism refuted by the Council of Nicæa, 56.
Article II. on the Incarnation, 47.
Article XXVIII. does not refer to the Tridentine definition of transubstantiation, 227; does not say that reservation is in itself objectionable, 232.
Article XXXIV. conveys no right to abrogate the law of Fasting Communion, 264, 265.
Ascension of CHRIST included in the Redemption, 81.
Assisting grace, 120.
Atonement, the, in its relation to the Incarnation, 65; complexity in the idea of the Atonement, 65; little help from authorized definitions, 66; Holy Scripture our chief guide to its comprehension, 66; ideas of it sometimes paradoxical because fragmentary, 66; the various truths which make up the doctrine, 67; three preliminary facts to be considered: a twofold conception of sin,—a sense of alienation from GOD, and a conviction of guilt, 67; (note on the difficulty in the phrase "the wrath of GOD," 68;) universal existence of the idea of sacrifice, 69; involving twofold idea,—love the essential idea, 69; sin and penitence a secondary element, 70; twofold conception of the effects of sacrifice,—as reconciling man with GOD, 70, and as removing guilt and its punishment, 70; GOD'S Attributes of Mercy and Truth in relation to sin, set forth in Holy Scripture, 71, and found outside Revelation, 72; these two views of GOD set forth by Stoics and Epicureans, Pharisees and Sadducees, Calvinists and Universalists, 72; the Cross of CHRIST the reconciliation of the paradox, 73; illustrated by the story of Zaleucus, 73; the elements of the doctrine of the Atonement, 74; propitiation, 74; obedience gave the Death of CHRIST its propitiatory value, 75; expiation for the past another element in propitiation, 76; death and victory over death essential to propitiation, 76; vicarious suffering, 77; the willingness of the Sufferer, 78; the principle of vicarious suffering found in human experience, 78; the representative character of the Victim, 78; reconciliation of GOD and man, by deliverance from sin, 79, by the gift of Divine life, 79, and by the imparted righteousness of CHRIST, 79; three stages in the work of Redemption: deliverance from sin, 80, the gift of life, 80, and the gift of union with GOD, 80; the Re-

demption includes the Resurrection and Ascension of CHRIST, 81; by which He becomes our Mediator and Great High Priest, 81; importance of grasping all the elements of this doctrine, 82; the merits of the Atonement of no avail unless appropriated by the individual through faith, 82; this faith not only objective but subjective, 82; the Sacrifice of CHRIST offered to the Holy Trinity, but especially to GOD the FATHER, 82; it includes all good works wrought in CHRIST, 82; among its benefits are the Sacraments, 83, and His merits, the treasure of the Church, 84.

Attributes of GOD, 3; incommunicable, 5; communicable, 7; necessary, not arbitrary, 11; manifested in His Providence, 11.

Attrition, 165; its relation to Contrition, 188.

B.

Baptism: The consequences of the Fall, 130; their remedy, affecting human nature, and applied to individuals, 130; first by Baptism, 130; the teaching of ancient theologians concerning it, 131; three modes of Baptism: the Baptism of Water, 131, of Blood, 131, and of Desire, 131; explicitly illustrated by the case of Valentinian II., 132; implicit desire discussed, 132; case of infants, 132, of adults, 132, of Quakers, 132; difference between man in a state of nature and of grace, —the state of nature, 133, 134; the state of grace, 133; the teaching of CHRIST, 133; statement by S. Paul, 134; objection of Nicodemus, 134; man's possibilties in a state of nature, 134; case of an unbaptized adult, 134; unbaptized infants, 135; opinion of S. Thomas, 135; case of S. John Baptist, 136; the Sacrament of Baptism, 137; its institution, 137; matter, 138; form, 139; minister,—ordinarily a Priest, 139, but a layman sufficient, 140; schismatical and heretical Baptism valid, 140; the subject of Baptism, 140; its effects: regeneration, 140; remission of sin, 140; infusion of grace, 141; character, 141; light, life and union conferred in Baptism, 141; dispositions: for valid Baptism consent alone necessary, 142; for its benefits faith and penitence required in an adult, 142; no dispositions required in an infant, 142.

Belief in GOD's existence leads to belief in Revelation, 90.

Bessarion on the Eastern view of the form in the Eucharist, 206, 210.

Bible—*see* "Scripture."

Blosius' description of the two sorts of servants of GOD, 310.

Body, possessed by Angels? 26; effects of the Eucharist upon it, 213; what is the body? 223; body of a whirlwind, 224; to a glorified body matter not necessary, but possible, 224; body assumed by Angel with Tobit, 224; with Abraham, 225;

Body of our LORD after His Resurrection, 225; the body affected by Communion, 252.
British Church (ancient), its liturgy probably Ephesian, 272.

C.

Calvinism, its view of GOD, 72; idea of the Real Presence, 221.
Candles, 276.
Canon of the Mass: Consecration, 274; Communion, 274; Post-Communion, 274.
Capernaite view of the Real Presence, 227.
Cardinal virtues, 149.
Cassock, 278.
Catastrophe to the earth, 24, 33.
Catastrophes, two, modifying the original plan of the Incarnation, 50.
Chancel of the Church, 275.
Character conferred in Baptism, 141; in Confirmation, 147.
Charity the grace of the Sacrament of Penance, 165.
Chasuble, 279.
Cherubim, 27.
Choir of the Church, 276.
Choirs of Angels, the nine, 26; their various functions, 27.
CHRIST, His Divine Personality, 55; the Son of Mary—His Human Soul, 57; the SON of GOD—no Human Personality, 58; acts of His Divine Nature, 58; of His Human Nature, 59; theandric acts, 59; defined by S. John Damascene, 59; the liberty of CHRIST, 60; permanence of the Hypostatic Union, 60; His dereliction, 60; His knowledge, 61; His economic ignorance, 62; the "Communicatio Idiomatum," 62; illustrated from S. Proclus, 63; CHRIST'S obedience gave His Death its propitiatory value, 75; His vicarious suffering, 77; its willingness, 78; His representative character in the Atonement, 78; His righteousness imparted, 79; our Mediator and Great High Priest, 81; His teachings about Baptism, 133; institution of Confirmation, 144; endowed with the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, as foretold by Isaiah, 148; CHRIST'S words prove His real Presence in the Eucharist, 214; His Life on earth brought before us by the different parts of the Divine Liturgy, 281.
Christian, the, endowed with the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 149, which are his weapons, 158.
Christianity, its view of GOD, 20; parallelisms with it found in heathen systems, 53; distinguished from all other religions by its claim to dispense grace, 114.
Christian life, the, developed by the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 157.
Church, the, formation, 84; definition, 85; Church Triumphant, 85; Church Expectant, 85; Church Militant, 85; spoken of as the Bride of CHRIST, 85, as the Body of CHRIST, 85, as the Kingdom of Heaven, 86; the Apostolic Succession contrasted with the sectarian ministry, 86; the Ministry of the Church, 87; the four principal functions of

the Church, 87; the Church the teacher of absolute truth, 88; its scriptural authority, 88; man's thirst for truth and freedom, 89, spheres of truth: scientific, 89, and metaphysical, 90; metaphysical truth leads to theology, 90; belief in GOD's existence leads to belief in Revelation, 90; the rival claims of philosophy as a teacher, 90; the confession of philosophers, 91; the Church's sphere of truth, 92; necessary truth, 92; speculative truth, 92; the method of the Church's teaching: Creeds, 92; General Councils, 92; consensus of theologians and of the faithful, 93; rule of S. Vincent of Lerins, 93; sectarian teaching tested by it, 93; the Church as the guide in morals, 94; history of ethics, 94; confession of moralists, 94; the Church's code of morals, 95; matter, 95; form, 95; scientific moralists differ concerning the basis of morals, 96, the standard of morals, 96, and the necessity of morals, 96; the Church's basis, 96, standard, 96, and theory of necessity, 96; the basis of the Church's code of morals, 97; its sphere of morals: precepts, 97; counsels, 97; the Church's code tested by the rule of S. Vincent, 97; two objections: conscience as the only guide, 98; civil law as the sufficient guide, 98; the Church as the dispenser of grace, 99, 114; as the director of worship, 100; importance of a law of worship, 100; a fallacious theory positively refuted, 100, by the example of Korah, 101, of Uzzah, 101, and negatively by our LORD, 101; the Church's ritual symbolical, 102; the Church the only dispenser of the Sacraments, 123; endowed with the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 149.

Civil law not a sufficient guide in morals, 98.

Collapse of man's nature at the Fall, 51.

Colours (five) of the seasons, 277.

Commission, sins of, 181.

Communicable Attributes of GOD, 7.

Communicatio Idiomatum, 62; illustrated from S. Proclus, 63.

Communion, the Holy: GOD's gift and conservation of life, 249; in the work of conservation GOD uses means, 249; the law of food, 249; in the preservation of physical life, 249; of mental life, 249; of spiritual life, 250; the Holy Eucharist the key to many mysteries, 250; its relation to the lower creation through the law of food, 250; this law does not stop at man, 251; in the Holy Communion no real reversal of it, 251; the Eucharist is to the moral world what the sun is to the material, its centre, 251; the chief effects of Communion—special: perfection and conservation, 252; closer union with CHRIST, 252; remission of sin, 252; restoration of a certain "integrity," 252; general effects: the Holy Communion acts upon the affections, 252;

the intellect, 252; the will, 252; it affects also the body, 252; effects peculiar to each species, 253; the twelve fruits of Communion according to S. Thomas, 253; it drives away the devil, 253; it cools the heat of desire, 254; it cleanses the stain of the heart, 254; it appeases the anger of GOD, 254; illumination of the intellect, 254; kindling of the affections, 255; remedy against lack of perseverance, 255; strength for our work, 255; freedom from eternal death, 256; increase of merit, 256; consolation and guidance in our exile, 257; the pledge and means of resurrection to eternal life, 257; dispositions and preparation, 257; preparation of the soul, 258; the dignity of the Holy Sacrament demands faith, 258; purity, 259; the cleansing of the soul, 260; works of penance, 260; kindling of charity, 260; prayer, 260; lessons taught by the bread used, 260; lessons from the Paschal lamb, 261; from the lamb itself, 261; from the three ceremonies at the feast, 261; from the equipment of the eaters, 262; summary of preparation of the soul, 262; preparation of the body, 262; fasting Communion the absolute law of the Catholic Church, 262; S. Augustine's witness to this law, 263; other Fathers, 263; report of the Committee of the English House of Bishops in 1894, 263; their extraordinary conclusion, 264; fallacy of their argument from Article XXXIV., 264; the law not "only by man's authority," 265; never changed or abrogated by any act of the Church of England, 265; such action quite "ultra vires," 265; to neglect of the law may be traced irreverence and loss of faith, 265; the Viaticum the only exception to this rule, 266; three methods of eating: sacramentally only, 266; spiritually only, 266; sacramentally and spiritually, 267; thanksgiving after Communion, 268; frequency of Communion, 268.

Concomitance, *222*.

Concupiscence, the term explained, 41; not sin, 42.

Confession, *see* "Penance."

Confirmation, its titles, 144; instituted by CHRIST, 144; its matter—four opinions: imposition of hands, 145, chrism, 145, twofold matter, 145, and chrismation, that is imposition of hands together with anointing, 145; the form: Roman, 146; Eastern, 146; Anglican, 146; the Minister, 146; the subject, 147; dispositions, 147; effects: character, 147, and special gift of the HOLY GHOST, 148; all the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST potentially received in Confirmation, 156; Confirmation the armament of the Christian, 158; parallel of the ceremony of Knighthood, 159.

"Confiteor" addressed to GOD, 192.

Conflict of the human will and first motions, 41.

Conscience not a sufficient guide in morals, 98.
Consensus of theologians a means of teaching truth, 93.
Conservation, 23; effected by the Eucharist, 212, 252; by the use of means, 249.
Consubstantiation and the Real Presence, 221.
Contrition, 165; definition, 187; its fruits, 189; how to obtain contrition, 191; sacramental Confession a help to, 193.
Co-operating grace, 120.
Coresius, Georgius, on the Eastern view of the form in the Eucharist, 209.
Council of Nicæa refuted Arianism, 56; of Constantinople, Apollinarianism, 56; of Ephesus, Nestorianism, 56; of Chalcedon, Eutychianism, 57; of Carthage determined the books of Holy Scripture, 108; of Florence, A.D. 1439, on the Eastern view of the form in the Eucharist, 208.
Councils, General, a means of teaching truth, 92.
Counsel, the Gift of the HOLY GHOST, 154; produces the moral theologians, 157.
Counsels of the Church, 97.
Created grace, 118.
Creation, the overflow of GOD'S Love, 21; theological meaning of the term, 21; three creative acts in Gen. i., 22; GOD'S use of means in creation, 22; creative acts probably few, 23; creation instantaneous, 23; creation of the world in time, 23; account in Gen. i. divided into two parts, 23; a creation, 23, and a restoration after a catastrophe, 24; no authoritative theory of the Six Days, 24; end or purpose of creation, 24; the motive GOD'S Free Will and Love, 24; the Three Persons co-operated, 25; creation of things material and spiritual, 25; creation and fall of the Angels, *see* "Angels"; creation and fall of man, *see* "Man"; all things created for a perfect end, 48; creation the act of GOD'S Antecedent Will, 49.
Creationism, 36.
Creeds a means of teaching truth, 92.
Cross, used in ritual, 276; Sign of the, 280.

D.

David, an example of the punishment of pardoned sin, 198.
Dead works, 166.
Death, a result of sin, 49; no part of the original purpose of the Incarnation, 49; Death of CHRIST, *see* Atonement.
Deed, sins of, 183.
Depravity (total) of human nature an exaggeration, 39.
Dereliction of CHRIST, 60.
Development of inorganic matter upon earth, 48; of organic life, 48; of moral life, 48; of Divine life, 48.
Dichotomy, 34.
Discipline of the intellect Adam's only restriction, 38.
Discord in human nature the chief result of Adam's sin, 40.
Dispositions required for the efficacy of Sacraments, 125; for Baptism, 142; for Confirmation, 147; for Penance, 164; for the Eucharist, 257.
Distractions in prayer, 298.

Doctrine of the Church, the three witnesses to it, 103; tradition defined, 103, and illustrated from man's physical nature, 104; tradition and the Unction of the HOLY GHOST, 105; two results of this: the Church's doctrines are infallible, 105; and unchangeable, 105; analogy of the growth of a tree, 106; the Church's doctrines tested, 106; the same doctrines among heretics, 106; Holy Scripture not the first "fons" of doctrine, 106; the Protestant view of the Bible false in fact, 107; Holy Scripture first a witness to doctrine, afterwards a "fons," 107; from the Council of Carthage, Scripture a source of the Church's doctrine, 108; result of the Protestant view of the Bible, 108; human reason a witness to doctrine, 109; relation of reason and Revelation, 109; on examination Revelation commends itself to reason, 110, offers a solution of many problems, 110, and satisfies man's cravings, 110; the answer to "What is truth?" 110; what the teachings of the Church are, 111; whither seekers after truth are led, 111; does the Church's teaching satisfy? 112; the Catholic Faith the Revelation of CHRIST, perpetuated by Tradition, 112, witnessed to by Holy Scripture, 113, and accepted by human reason, 113; a threefold cord not easily broken, 113.
Dominions, 28.
Drunkenness and kindred habits scientifically demand a Fall, 45.
Dualism, 19.

E.

Earth, the, created in time, 23; wrecked by the malice of the fallen angels, 24, 33; restored, 24, 33.
Eastern Church, form of Confirmation, 146; view of form in the Eucharist, 206; this view examined and found incorrect according to Bessarion, 206, from the general action of prayer, 207, and from the position of the Oblation, 207; the view lacks antiquity, 208; as discussed by the Council of Florence, A. D. 1439, 208; view explained by John Maro, 209, and by Georgius Coresius, 209; speech of Bessarion, 210; S. Chrysostom quoted, 210; the Eastern Church accepts transubstantiation, 227.
Eastern mystics helped to prepare for CHRIST, 52.
Economic ignorance of CHRIST, 62.
Efficient grace, 120.
Egyptians helped to prepare for CHRIST, 52.
Elevating grace, 119.
End or purpose of creation, 24.
English House of Bishops, report on Fasting Communion in 1894, 263; their extraordinary conclusion, 264; fallacy of their argument from Article XXXIV., 264.
Epicureans, their view of GOD, 72.
Essence, metaphysical, of GOD, 4; one essence in the Holy Trinity, 13.
Eternal Generation of the SON of GOD, 13.
Eternity of GOD, 6.
Ethics, history of, 94.

Eucharist, the, definition, 202; titles, 202; excellences, 203; types, 203; institution, 203; the Agent, 204; our LORD both Victim and Priest, 205; a third division in this Sacrament, 205; the essentials of the Sacrament, 205; matter: bread, 205; wine, 205; mixed chalice, 205; form 206; Western view, 206; Eastern view, 206; examined, 206; it is incorrect, as appears from Bessarion's testimony, 206; from the general action of prayer, 207; from the position of the Oblation, 207; it lacks antiquity, 208; Council of Florence, A. D. 1439, 208; explanation of John Maro, 209; of Georgius Coresius, 209; speech of Bessarion, 210; S. Chrysostom quoted, 210; Western view therefore correct, 211; Minister, 211; subject, 211; effects of the Sacrament, 211; on the soul: perfection and conservation, 212; strength and closer union, 212; remission of sin, 212; effects on the body, 213; the Eucharist the key to many mysteries, 250; the Service in its different parts reminds us of our LORD'S Life on earth, 281.
Eutychianism refuted by the Council of Chalcedon, 57.
Evil as a possibility necessary to a moral choice, 51.
Exciting grace, 120.
Expiation for the past an element in propitiation, 76.
Explicit desire for Baptism illustrated by the case of Valentinian II., 132.
External grace, 118.

F.

Faith, necessary to any benefit from the Atonement, 82; not only objective, but subjective, 82; required in prayer, 288, 292.
Faith, the Catholic, the Revelation of CHRIST, 112; perpetuated by Tradition, 112; witnessed to by Holy Scripture, 113; accepted by human reason, 113.
Fall, of the Angels, 31; of man, 39; its results, 39; errors about it, 43; man's losses by it, 43; Catholic view of it, 44; not recognized by science, 44; the only explanation of the moral struggle, 44; scientifically demanded by drunkenness and kindred habits, 45; remedied by GOD'S Consequent Will, 50; the Fall caused a collapse in man's nature, 51; and a new preparation for the Incarnation, 51; man's losses by it restored by the Incarnation, 54; consequences of the Fall, 130; their remedy, 130; affecting human nature, 130, and applied to individuals, 130.
Fasting a part of the rule of life, 306.
Fasting Communion the absolute law of the Catholic Church, 262; S. Augustine's witness to the law, 263; other Fathers, 263; report of the Committee of the English House of Bishops in 1894, 263; their extraordinary conclusion, 264; fallacy of their argument from Article XXXIV., 264; the law not "only by man's authority," 265; never

Fasting Communion—*Cont.*
changed or abrogated by any act of the Church of England, 265; such action quite "ultra vires," 265; to neglect of the law may be traced irreverence and loss of faith, 265; the Viaticum the only exception to it, 266.
First grace, the, 119; conveyed by Baptism, 141; by the Sacrament of Penance, 165.
First motions, the term explained, 41; conflict with the human will, 41.
Form of a Sacrament, 124; of Baptism, 139; of Confirmation, 146; of Penance, 163; of the Holy Eucharist, 206; of prayer, 295.
Formal sin, 176.
Free Will and Love of GOD the motive of creation, 24.
Freedom, man's thirst for, 89.
Fruits, of the SPIRIT, produced by the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 158; of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 244; of Communion, according to S. Thomas, 253.
Functions, of the Nine Choirs of Angels, 27; of the Church, 87.

G.

Gallican Liturgy of Ephesian origin, 272.
Generation of GOD the SON eternal, 13.
Generationism, 36.
Genuflection, 280.
Geology a record of progress, 50.
Gethsemane, lessons of our LORD'S Prayer, 290, 294.
Ghostly Strength (Might), 152; produces the martyrs, 157.
Gift of Divine Life in the Atonement, 80; of union with GOD, 80.
Gifts possessed by man before the Fall, 40; præternatural, 40; lost to man by the Fall, 43.
Gifts, the Seven, of the HOLY GHOST, foretold by Isaiah, 148; the endowment, of CHRIST, 148, of the Church, 149, and of the Christian, 149; the virtues of man: natural or cardinal, 149, theological, 149, and the action of the Seven Gifts, 149; effects of One HOLY SPIRIT, 150; four Gifts intellectual, three moral, 150; relation of the Gifts to the Theological Virtues, 150; the Seven Gifts in their several effects: Holy Fear, 151; Piety, 151; Ghostly Strength (Might), 152; Knowledge, 153; knowledge of creatures, 153, and of their true end, 153, guides us in our life and work, 153; Counsel, 154; Understanding, 154; gives a knowledge of GOD in His Perfections, Ways, Word, Religion and Providence, 154; Wisdom, 155; gives sweetness, 155, and intuition, 155; all Seven Gifts potentially received in Confirmation, 156; their special operations produce certain classes in the Church: Holy Fear, the saints, 156; Piety, the builders of Churches, etc., 156; Ghostly Strength, the martyrs, 157; Knowledge, the apologists, 157; Counsel, the moral theologians, 157; Understanding, the dogmatic theologians, 157; Wisdom, the ascetic theologians, 157; the Gifts develop a Christian life, 157, as revealed in the Beati-

Gifts—*Continued.*
tudes, 158; the Gifts are the remedy for the Seven Deadly Sins, 158; they produce the Fruits of the SPIRIT, in our life towards GOD, 158, towards our neigbour, 158, and towards ourselves, 158; they are the weapons of the Christian, 158.
Girdle, 278.
GOD: The question of S. Thomas Aquinas, "Quid est Deus?" 1; value of accurate knowledge of GOD in times of trial, 2, and as a basis for prayer, 3; GOD'S Nature and Attributes, 3; Metaphysical Essence, 4; Incommunicable Attributes: Infinity, 5; Unity, 5; Simplicity, 5; Immutability, 5; Eternity, 6; Immensity, 6; Omnipresence, 6; Communicable Attributes: Spirit, 7; Life, 7; Knowledge, 7; Will (Peter Lombard's view—S. John Damascene's view), 8; Moral qualities: Wisdom, 9; Holiness, 9; Justice, 9; Truth, 9; Goodness, 9; Happiness, 9; Power, 9; Absolute Power, 10; Ordinary Power, 10; Love, 11; GOD'S Attributes necessary, not arbitrary, 11; manifested in His Providence, 11; the Holy Trinity, 12; definition, 13; one Essence, 13; two Processions, 13; Procession of the SON—Eternal Generation, 13; Procession of the HOLY SPIRIT—one Spiration, 14; three Persons, 15; four Relations, 16; five Notions, 16; Perichoresis, 17; errors of Sabellianism and Tritheism, 17; the five views of GOD: Pantheism, 18; Polytheism, 18; Dualism, 19; Monotheism, 19; Christianity, 20; the two views of GOD throughout history, 72; GOD and man reconciled by the Atonement, 79; belief in GOD'S existence leads to belief in Revelation, 90; GOD the Author of the Sacraments, 123.
GOD the FATHER, the Sacrifice of CHRIST offered especially to, 82; the malice of sin against, 174.
GOD the SON, Eternal Generation of, 13; Procession from the FATHER, 13; Virgin Birth, 54; why He took impersonal human nature, 55; the malice of sin against Him, 174.
GOD the HOLY GHOST, Procession from the FATHER and the SON, 14; one Spiration, 14; the Agent in the Incarnation, 57; received especially in Confirmation, 148; One, though Sevenfold in His Gifts, 150; His Seven Gifts potentially received, 156; the malice of sin against Him, 175; His help necessary to a good self-examination, 185; the Agent in the Eucharist, 204.
Goodness of GOD, 9.
Grace, sanctifying, possessed by man before the Fall, 40; supernatural, lost to man by the Fall, 43; the Church the dispenser of grace, 99, 114; Judaism taught truth and morals, but grace the distinguishing feature of Christianity, 114; the fruit of the Incarnation and Atonement, 115; the preparation for Glory, 115; it is the difference between the natural and supernatura

Grace—*Continued.*
man, 115; in Christian life grace permeates every action, 116; the Order of Grace, 116; greatness of the subject, 116; definition of grace, in worldly usage, 116; theologically: in the most general sense, 116, in a restricted sense, 117, and in the strict sense, 117; divisions of grace: "of the first state" and "of the second state," or the grace of GOD and the grace of CHRIST, 117; "gratia gratis data," and "gratum faciens," 117; uncreated and created, 118; external and internal, 118; habitual and actual, 118; the "first grace," and the "second grace," 119; divisions of actual grace: illumination and inspiration, 119; grace of the intellect and of the will, 119; medicinal and elevating grace, 119; exciting, operating or prevailing, and assisting, co-operating or accompanying grace, 120; sufficient and efficient grace, 120; the Sacraments the chief means of grace, 120; channels of grace, 122; they confer grace "ex opere operato," 122, and not "ex opere operantis," 122; sanctifying grace, 40, 129; hindered by venial sin, 180; sacramental grace, or "grace of the Sacrament," 129; grace of the Sacrament of Penance, 165; grace of the Eucharist works "ex opere operato," 247; but in impetration also "ex opere operantis," 247.
"Gratia gratis data," 117.
"Gratia gratum faciens," 117.
Greek Church—*see* "Eastern Church."
Greeks helped to prepare for CHRIST, 52.
Guardian Angels, 29.

H.

Habitual grace, 118.
Habitual sin, 175.
Happiness of GOD, 9.
Heathen, their idea of sacrifice, 69, 70, 234.
Heredity explains original sin, 44.
Hierarchies of the Angels, three, 27.
Holiness of GOD, 9.
Holy Fear, the Gift of the HOLY GHOST, 151; produces the saints, 156.
HOLY GHOST—*see* "GOD the HOLY GHOST."
HOLY SPIRIT—*see* "GOD the HOLY GHOST."
Hope exercised in prayer, 288, 293.
Human Nature—*see* "Nature of Man."
Human Personality — *see* "Personality of Man."
Human Soul—*see* "Soul of Man."
Human Will—*see* "Will of Man."
Humility one of the benefits of Sacramental Confession, 193; necessary in prayer, 293.
Hypostatic Union, the, preserved in the Incarnation, 60; and in the Eucharist, 229.

I.

Ignorance, economic, of CHRIST, 62.
Illumination by grace, 119.
Image of GOD in human nature as created, 33; not lost by the Fall, 43

Immensity of GOD, 6.
Immortality of the human soul, 35; immortality possible in three ways, 35.
Immutability of GOD, 5.
Impetration, one end of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 246.
Implicit desire for Baptism discussed, 132.
Incarnation, the, the keystone of Christianity, 46; yet often but imperfectly understood, 46; is the Revelation of GOD, and of man, 46; reveals the end and purpose of man's creation, 46; the truth set forth in Article II., 47; why did the Incarnation take place?—Thomist view, 47; Scotist view, 47; examined, 48; all things created for a perfect end, 48; a law of progress, 48; four epochs of this progress in our planet: development of inorganic matter, 48; of organic life, 48; of moral life, 48; of Divine life, 48; creation the act of GOD'S Antecedent Will, 49; the material world found its climax in man, 49, and by the incarnation was to be taken with man into GOD, 49, without suffering and death, 49; geology a record of progress, 50; two catastrophes which led to a modification of the original plan, 50; the remedy for the Fall provided by GOD'S Consequent Will, 50; after the Fall a new preparation for the Incarnation, in Judaism, 51; and everywhere, 52; Eastern mystics, Chaldean and Egyptian sages, Greeks and Romans all helped to prepare for CHRIST, 52; Roman roads, 52; parallelisms between heathen religions and Christianity, 53; instead of the last step in the Gospel of Creation the Incarnation became the first in the Gospel of Redemption, 53, 54; by it was restored what had been lost by the Fall, 54; the Incarnation as a fact, 54; definition, 54; the means of its accomplishment, 54; the Virgin Birth, 54; human nature and human personality, 55; why the Word took impersonal human nature, 55; four heresies in regard to the Incarnation refuted by Councils: Arianism, by Nicæa, 56; Apollinarianism, by Constantinople, 56; Nestorianism, by Ephesus, 56; Eutychianism, by Chalcedon, 57; the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, 57; the HOLY GHOST the Agent, 57; CHRIST the Son of Mary,—His Human Soul, 57; CHRIST the SON of GOD,—no Human Personality, 58; consequences of human nature being assumed by GOD, 58; the actions of CHRIST: acts of the Divine Nature, 58; acts of the Human Nature, 59; theandric acts, 59; definition of S. John Damascene, 59; the liberty of CHRIST, 60; the Hypostatic Union permanent, 60; the Dereliction, 60; the knowledge of CHRIST, 61; His economic ignorance, 62; "Communicatio Idiomatum," 62; illustrated from S. Proclus, 63; relation of the Atonement to the Incarnation, 65.
Incense, 279.

Incommunicable Attributes of GOD, 5.
Infants, unbaptized, 132, 135.
Infinity of GOD, 5.
Infusion of grace, in Baptism, 141; in Confirmation, 148; in Penance, 165; in the Eucharist, 252.
Inspiration by grace, 119.
Integrity, the term explained, 42; integrity of man before the Fall, 42; lost by the Fall, causing a tendency to evil, 43; restored by Communion, 252.
Intellect, the, appealed to in Adam's temptation, 38; grace of, 119; acted upon by Communion, 252, 254.
Intellectual discipline Adam's only restriction, 38; intellectual desire undisciplined the chief temptation even now, 39.
Intention of the minister of a Sacrament, 124.
Internal grace, 118.
Intuitive knowledge of the Angels, 26.
Invocation of the HOLY GHOST in the Eucharist, 206–211; invocation a part of the form of prayer, 296.
Isaiah, his prophecy of the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 148.
Israelites, the, an example of the punishment of pardoned sin, 197.

J.

Jewish idea of sacrifice, 234.
Joy of prayer, 294.
Judaism, a preparation for the Incarnation, 51; taught truth and morals, 114.
Justice of GOD, 9, 68.

K.

Knighthood, the ceremony compared with Confirmation, 159.
Knowledge, about GOD valuable in time of trial, 2, and in prayer, 3; knowledge of GOD, 7; of the Angels, 26; of Adam, 37; of CHRIST, 61; the Gift of the HOLY GHOST, 153; knowledge of creatures, 153, and of their true end, 153, guides us in our life and work, 153; produces the apologists, 157.
Korah an example of the importance of a law of worship, 101.

L.

Law, of progress, 48; civil, not a sufficient guide in morals, 98; of worship, 100; of food, the means of conservation, 249; through it the Eucharist extends to the lower creation, 250; law of food does not stop at man, 251; is not really reversed in the Eucharist, 251.
Liberty of CHRIST, 60.
Life, an attribute of GOD, 7; organic—its development in our planet, 48; moral, 48; Divine, 48; life conferred in Baptism, 141; the gift of GOD, 249; preserved by means of food, 249.
Light conferred in Baptism, 141.
Lightfoot, Bp., introduction to S. Clement's Epistle, pointing out liturgical quotations, 270; his three questions, 270.
Liturgy (the), antiquity illustrated by York Minster, 269; the Liturgy to many a

Liturgy—*Continued.*
hidden treasure, 270; carries us back to the first Maundy Thursday, 270; Bp. Lightfoot's introduction to S. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, 270; points out traces of liturgical prayers, 270; the translator's three questions, 270; traces of a form of liturgy in S. Paul's writings, 271; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 271; the Apostolic Liturgy, 271; at first unwritten, but committed to memory on account of the "disciplina arcani," 271; no service-books surrendered by the traditores, 271; written liturgies date from the time of Constantine, 271; the Apostolic Constitutions, 272; five families of liturgies, 272; probably all descended from the Apostolic Liturgy, 272; sameness of structure in all, 272; the Liturgy of the British Church probably Ephesian, like the Gallican, 272; the Liturgy of our Church Petrine or Roman, 272; Liturgies divided into two parts, Anaphora and Pro-Anaphora, 272; the term "Mass," 273; its derivation, 273; used by S. Ambrose, A.D. 385, 273; and in the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI., 273; Ordinary and Canon, 273; Ordinary: Introduction, 274, and Offertory, 274; Canon: Consecration, 274, Communion, 274, and Post-Communion, 274; the ritual of the Liturgy, 274; source of the Mosaic ritual, 274; of the Church's ritual, 274; it carries us forward to Heaven, 275, and backward to Calvary, 275; the symbolism of Church architecture, 275; the nave, 275; the chancel, 275; the choir, 276; the Altar, 276; the Cross, 276; the candles, 276; the Altar-cloths, 277; the five colours, 277; the vestments, 278: the cassock, 278; amice, 278; alb, 278; girdle, 278; stole, 278; maniple, 278; chasuble, 279; incense, 279; genuflection, 280; the Sign of the Cross, 280; the different parts of the Service may be taken to remind us of the principal acts of our LORD'S Life: the Introit, 281; Our FATHER, 282; Commandments and Kyries, 282; Epistle, 282; Gospel, 282; Creed, 282; Offertory: Bread and Wine—Alms, 282; Exhortation, 282; Confession, 282; Comfortable Words, 282; Sanctus, 282; Prayer of Humble Access, 282; Consecration, 282; Fracture of the Host, 282; Elevation, 282; Communion of the people, 283; covering of the chalice, 283; Gloria in Excelsis, 283; Benediction, 283; hints to Communicants, 283.

Lombard, Peter, view of the Will of GOD, 8.

Long Exhortation, teaching about Absolution, 168, 169.

Love of GOD, 11; His Love and Free Will the motive of creation, 24; love a result of prayer, 288.

Lucifer, three views of his sin, 30; his fall, 31.

Lutheranism, its error in regard to the Fall, 44; to the Real Presence, 221.

M.

Man, created to fill the places of the fallen Angels, 32, 33; human nature as created, 33; in GOD'S Image, 33; dichotomy and trichotomy, 34; the soul of man, 35; immortal, 35; three ways in which a being may be immortal, 35; man not only rational but religious, 36; origin of the soul: Traducianism, 36; Generationism, 36; Creationism, 36; was man created in a state of nature, or of grace? 36; man in the supernatural state, 36; Adam's trial, 36; his knowledge, 37; the Tempter appealed to the passion of curiosity by suggesting a doubt about a truth of Revelation, 37; by denying a truth of Revelation, 37; by removing the fear of the consequences of sin, 37; by promising a great reward, 37; Adam's temptation a type of all temptation, 38; temptation analyzed, 38; Adam restricted only by intellectual discipline, 38; the temptation appealed to the intellect, 38; as S. Bernard shows, 38; three steps in the temptation, 39; undisciplined desire of the intellect the chief temptation even now, 39; consequences of Adam's sin, 39; total depravity an exaggeration as well as Pelagianism, 39; the chief result was discord in man's nature, 40; before the Fall man possessed sanctifying grace, 40, and præternatural gifts, 40; explanation of terms—"natural," 40; "præternatural," 40; "supernatural," 41; "concupiscence," 41; "first motions," 41; the moral struggle, 41; not two wills conflicting, but the will and first motions, 41; struggle traced to opposite causes, 42; "integrity," 42; concupiscence not sin, 42; what man lost by the Fall: all supernatural grace, 43; and præternatural gifts, 43; original sin a privation of gifts, 43; and a tendency to evil from the loss of integrity, 43; Image of GOD not lost, 43; two chief errors in regard to the Fall: Pelagianism, 43; Lutheranism, 44; the Catholic view, 44; science blind to a Fall, 44; yet the only explanation of moral struggle, 44; heredity explains original sin, 44; drunkenness and kindred habits scientifically demand a Fall, 45; man the climax of the material world, 49; a moral being, 50; reconciled to GOD by the Atonement, 79; by deliverance from sin, the gift of Divine Life, and the imparted righteousness of CHRIST, 79; man's thirst for truth and freedom, 89; man in a state of nature and in a state of grace—the difference, 115, 133; his possibilities in a state of nature, 134.

Maniple, 278.

Manner of prayer, 292.

Maro, John, on the Eastern view of the form in the Eucharist, 209.

Mass, interrupted, 247; private, 248; solitary, forbidden, 248; derivation and history of the word, 273; Ordinary and Canon of, 273, 274.

Material sin, 176.
Material things created, 25; material world had its climax in man, 49.
Matter, inorganic, its development in our planet, 48; matter of a Sacrament, 124; of Baptism, 138; of Confirmation, 145; of Penance, 162, 163; of the Holy Eucharist, 205; matter not necessary to a glorified body, but possible, 224; matter of prayer, 291.
Means, GOD'S use of, 22.
Medicinal grace, 119.
Mental prayer, 298.
Mercy and Truth of GOD in relation to sin, 71; set forth in Holy Scripture, 71, and found outside Revelation, 72; set forth by Stoics and Epicureans, by Pharisees and Sadducees, by Calvinists and Universalists, 72; the two ideas reconciled by the Cross, 73; illustrated by the story of Zaleucus, 73.
Merits, of CHRIST, unavailing without faith, 82; one of the benefits of His Sacrifice, 83; the treasure of the Church, 83; merits restored by Penance, 166; defined, 166; impossible in mortal sin, 166; increased by Communion, 256.
Metaphysical Essence of GOD, 4; metaphysical truth, 90; leads to theology, 90.
Minister of a Sacrament, 124; his intention, 124; minister of Baptism, 139; of Confirmation, 146; of Penance, 164; of the Eucharist, 211.
Ministry, of the sectarians, 86; of the Church, 87.
Mixed chalice, 205.
Monotheism, 19.
Moral qualities of GOD, 9; moral struggle, 41; traced to opposite causes, 42; to be accounted for only by a Fall, 44; moral choice involves a possibility of evil, 51.
Moralists, confession of discord, 94; differ about the basis, standard, and necessity of morals, 96.
Morals, the Church the guide in, 94; the Church's code of, 95; matter, 95; form, 95; discord in regard to the basis, standard, and necessity of, 96; the Church's basis, 96; standard, 96; theory of necessity, 96; basis of the Church's code, 97; the Church's sphere of morals: precepts, 97; counsels, 97; the Church's code tested by the Vincentian rule, 97; conscience not a sufficient guide, 98; civil law not a sufficient guide, 98; morals taught by Judaism, 114.
Mortal sin destroys grace, 160; renders merit impossible, 166; involves guilt and punishment, 167, 199; characteristics of, 177.
Mosaic Law typifies the Sacraments, 122; Mosaic ritual, 274; its source, 274.
Motive of creation, GOD'S Free Will and Love, 24.
Motto of our life, "Domine, non nisi Te!" 310.
"Mystery" as the equivalent of "Sacrament," 121.

N.

Natural, the term explained, 40; natural virtues, 149.
Nature, of GOD, 3; of Angels, 25; of man, as created, 33; having GOD'S Image, 33; discord within it, the chief

Nature—*Continued.*
result of Adam's sin, 40; its collapse at the Fall, 51; contrasted with personality, 55; why the Word took impersonal human nature, 55; consequences of this assumption, 58.
Nave of the Church, 275.
Nebuchadnezzar, an example of the punishment of pardoned sin, 198.
Nestorianism refuted by the Council of Ephesus, 56.
Nicodemus, his objection to the doctrine of Baptism, 134.
Notions of the Holy Trinity, five, 16.

O.

Obedience gave the Death of CHRIST its propitiatory value, 75.
Oblation in Heaven, 243.
Omission, sins of, 181; their number and extent, 181; their greatness in the sight of GOD, 182.
Omnipresence of GOD, 6.
Operating grace, 120.
"Order of grace," 116.
Ordinary of the Mass, 274; Introduction, 274; Offertory, 274.
Original sin, its nature, 43; explained by heredity, 44.

P.

Pantheism, 18.
Parable of the Lost Piece of Silver, illustrating self-examination, 185.
Parallelisms between heathen religions and Christianity, 53; between S. Bernard's preaching of the Second Crusade, and instruction for Confirmation, 300.
Paschal Lamb, its lessons on the Eucharist, 261.
Pelagianism, an exaggeration of man's condition, 39, 43.
Penance, the Sacrament of, supplies the need of a Sacrament for post-baptismal sin, 160; mortal sin destroys grace, 160; institution of the Sacrament of Penance, 160; penance as a virtue, 160; as a Sacrament, 161; a safeguard against self-deceit regarding one's spiritual state, 162; the Sacrament of Penance, — its matter, 162; proximate matter, 162; remote matter, 162; necessary matter, 163; voluntary matter, 163; the form, 163; the Minister, 164; the subject, 164; dispositions, 164; contrition, confession, and satisfaction, 165; attrition, 165; effects of Penance, 165; it conveys "first grace," 165; grace of the Sacrament, 165; sanctifying grace or chartiy, 165; restoration of merits, 166; merits defined, 166; in mortal sin we cannot merit, 166; dead works, 166; infused virtues revived by Penance, 166; mortal sin involves guilt and punishment, 167; forms of Absolution: declaratory at Matins and Evensong, 167; precatory in the Liturgy, 167; the rubric preceding it, 167; the Long Exhortation, 168; pardon of venial sin in response to prayer, 168; judicial form in the Sacrament of Penance, 169; precatory form sufficient, 169; a Sacrament can only be ministered to a subject, 169; teaching of the Exhortation, 169;

Penance—*Continued.*
Confession not compulsory, 170; the equivalent of the Sacrament, 170; history of Absolutions in the Liturgy, 171; definition of Confession, 191; frequent unreality of confession to GOD alone, 191; form of Confiteor addressed to GOD, 192; Confession in the Bible, 192; all people believe in Confession to man, 192; benefits of Confession to man: sympathy, 192; self-knowledge, 193; humility, 193; help to contrition, 193; counsel, 193; reasons for making Confession to a Priest: he is trained to give counsel, others are not, 194; he represents the Church, 194; the Sacramental Seal, 195; Absolution, 195; how to make a good Confession, 195; practical hints, 196; the satisfaction of CHRIST applied in Penance, 197; the penance imposed by the Priest, 199; penance an element of satisfaction, 200.
Penitence, conditions required for, 187; contrition,—definition, 187; attrition, 188; its relation to contrition, 188; signs of contrition, 189; fruits demanded, 189; readiness to confess, 189; readiness to amend, 190; readiness to avoid temptation, 190; readiness to forgive, 190; readiness to make satisfaction, 190; how to get contrition, 191; Confession,—definition, 191; frequent unreality of confession to GOD alone, 191; form of Confiteor addressed to GOD, 192; Confession in the Bible, 192; all people believe in Confession to man, 192; benefits of Confession to man,—sympathy, 192; self-knowledge, 193; humility, 193; help to contrition, 193; counsel, 193; reasons for making Confession to a Priest: he is trained to give counsel, others are not, 194; he represents the Church, 194; the Sacramental Seal, 195; Absolution, 195; how to make a good Confession, 195; practical hints, 196; Satisfaction, 196; definition, 197; the Satisfaction of CHRIST, 197; applied in Baptism, 197, and in Penance, 197; GOD inflicts temporal punishment for pardoned sin: example of the Israelites, 197; of David, 198; of Nebuchadnezzar, 198; the sense in which "satisfaction" is used of man, 198; two effects of mortal sin: guilt, 199, and punishment, 199; penance imposed by the Priest, 199; elements of Satisfaction: amendment, 200, restitution, 200, penance, 200, and reparation, 200.
Perfection, in the soul, effected by the Eucharist, 212, 252.
Perfections of GOD, 154.
Perichoresis in the Holy Trinity, 17.
Perseverance assisted by Communion, 255; necessary in prayer, 293.
Personality of man, 55; of CHRIST, 55, 58.
Persons in the Holy Trinity, three, 15.
Petition, the, a part of the form of prayer, 297.
Pharisees, their view of GOD, 72.

Philosophers, their confession of helplessness, 91.
Philosophy, its claims as a teacher of truth, 90.
Piety, the Gift of the HOLY GHOST, 151; produces the builders of Churches, etc., 156
Plea, the, a part of the form of prayer, 297.
Polytheism, 18.
Power of GOD, 9; Absolute, 10; Ordinary, 10.
Powers, 28.
Præternatural, the term explained, 40; præternatural gifts, possessed by man before the Fall, 40; lost to man by the Fall, 43.
Praise, one end of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 244.
Prayer, depends largely for its efficacy upon an accurate knowledge of GOD, 3; analogy between man's body and soul—prayer the atmosphere of the soul's life, 285; spiritual malaria, 286; nature of prayer, 286; definition, 286; three constituents, 286; the suppliant, 286; must be rational and possess free will, 286, and must be dependent, 287; one to whom prayer is made, 287; the act of prayer itself, 287; prayer the exercise of hope, 288; its foundation, faith, 288; its result, love, 288; its purpose, to fulfil the Will of GOD, 288; two results of prayer, 288; the objective result, 289, depends on co-operation with GOD, 289; prayer the motive power of spiritual life, 289; the subjective result, 290; the conforming of our will to GOD'S Will, 290; the lesson of Gethsemane, 290; the conditions of prayer, 291; matter, 291; those things which are for our good, 291; those things which are not, 291; those temporal blessings about which we are uncertain, 292; the suppliant, 292; the manner, 292; faith, 292; hope, 293; humility, 293; perseverance, 293; the joy of prayer, 294; seen in Gethsemane, 294, and on Tabor, 295; the structure of prayer, 295; the invocation, 296; the petition, 297; the plea, 297; the kinds of prayer, 297; vocal prayer, 297; mental prayer, 298; distractions in prayer, 298; prayer a part of the rule of life, 304.
Preparation for the Incarnation, begun anew after the Fall, 51; all nations helped in it, 52; preparation for Communion, 257.
Prevailing grace, 120.
Principalities, 28.
Pro-Anaphora, 272.
Processions in the Holy Trinity, two, 13; of the SON, 13; of the HOLY GHOST, 14.
Progress, law of, in creation, 48; in our planet divided into four epochs, 48; geology a record of, 50.
Propitiation, an element of the doctrine of the Atonement, 74; wrought by the obedience of CHRIST, 75; includes expiation for the past, 76; involves death, 76, and victory over death, 76; propitiation one end of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 246
Protestants, their view of the Bible false in fact, 107; result of this view, 108; their objections to the Real Presence answered, 216.

Providence of GOD, the manifestation of His Attributes, 11; manifested in our lives, 154.
Purpose or end of creation, 24.

Q.

Quakers, opinion as to their having "Baptism of Desire," 132.
Qualities, moral, of GOD, 9.
"Quid est Deus?" 1.

R.

Real Presence, the, in the Holy Eucharist, nature, 214; proofs from our LORD'S words, 214; Protestant objections and their answers, 216; the words were not figurative, 216; they were spiritual, but absolutely true, 218; analogy of CHRIST'S words to the woman of Samaria, 218; gross views guarded against, 219; the witness of the Church, 219; four erroneous views of the Presence: Zwinglianism, 220; Transubstantiation inaccurately taught, 220; Consubstantiation and Lutheranism, 221; Calvinism, or the Receptionist theory, 221; the four views summed up, 221; positive teaching of the Church, 222; nature of the Presence, 222; Concomitance, 222; mode inexplicable, 222; not natural or material, but supernatural, spiritual, supra-local, 222, and sacramental, 223; reception under one kind, 223; nature of the Body received, 223; what is man's body? 223; the body of a whirlwind, 224; matter not necessary to a glorified body, but possible, 224; example of Angels with Tobit, 224, and Abraham, 225; our LORD after His Resurrection, 225; mode of the Presence, 225; Tridentine definition, 225; "substance" an equivocal term, 226; a philosophical theory only, 226; substance defined by S. Thomas, 226; transubstantiation accepted by the Eastern Church, 227; Article XXVIII. does not refer to the Tridentine definition, 227; Capernaite view, 227; opinions of Romans as to the accidents, 228; Algerus quoted, 228; transubstantiation a metaphysical theory, 228; Eucharistic Adoration a duty, 229; from the fact of the Hypostatic Union, 229; for believers to neglect it is inconsistent, 229; Adoration an expression of love, 229; reservation for the sick a practice of the early Church, 230; the American Pastoral of 1895, 230; rubric examined, 230; does not refer to Reservation, 231; does not forbid it, 232; Article XXVIII., 232.
Reason, human, a witness to the doctrines of the Church, 109; relation to Revelation, 109; on examination, accepts Revelation, 110, 113.
Receptionist theory of the Real Presence, 221.
Reconciliation of GOD and man by the Atonement, 79.
Redemption, involves deliverance from sin, 80, the gift of life, 80, and union with GOD, 80; includes CHRIST'S Resurrection and Ascension, 81.
Regeneration in Baptism, 140.

Relations in the Holy Trinity, four, 16.
Religion revealed by GOD, 154.
Remission of sin, in Baptism, 140; to a certain extent in the Eucharist, 212, 252.
Reservation for the sick, 230; touched upon in the American Pastoral of 1895, 230; rubric examined, 230; does not refer to Reservation, 231; Article XXVIII., 232.
Restoration of the ruined earth, 24, 33; of merits by Penance, 166.
Resurrection of CHRIST included in the Redemption, 81.
Revelation of GOD in the Incarnation, 46, and of man, 46; relation of Revelation to human reason, 109; commends itself to reason, 110; offers a solution of many problems, 110; satisfies man's cravings, 110.
Ritual of the Christian Church symbolical, 102; of the Liturgy, 274; source of Christian ritual, 274.
Roman Church, form of Confirmation, 146; view of form in the Eucharist, 206; the view correct, 211; opinions of theologians as to the "accidents" in the Real Presence, 228.
Romans helped to prepare for the Incarnation, 52; and for the Gospel, by their roads, 52.
Rubric preceding the Absolution in the Liturgy, 167; at the end of the Communion Office, does not refer to Reservation, 230, 231.
Rule of life, the: S. Bernard preaching the Second Crusade—its parallel in Confirmation, 300; cause of failure, want of discipline, 301; rule of life—its importance, 301; to form habits, 301; to develop character, 302; to make life orderly, 302; to test progress, 302; an illustration of the value of a rule, 303; three characteristics of a good rule: definiteness, 303; generosity, 304; prudence, 304; the matter of a rule of life, 304; prayer, 304; private prayer, 304; public prayer, 304; spiritual reading, 305; almsgiving, 305; fasting, 306; cultivation of habits of virtue and devotion, 306; humility, 307; sincerity, 307; purity, 308; the vision of S. Thomas, 310; two sorts of servants of GOD, 310; the motto of our life, "Domine, non nisi Te," 310.

S.

Sabellianism, 17.
Sacramental grace, 129.
Sacramentals, 128.
Sacraments, the chief means of grace, 120; definition, 120; history of the word "sacrament," 121; "mystery" as its equivalent, 121; wider use of "sacrament" until the twelfth century, 121; the Sacraments channels of grace, 122; confer grace "ex opere operato," and not "ex opere operantis," 122; Sacraments typified in Mosaic Law, 122; their number limited to seven, 123; GOD their Author, 123; the Church their only dispenser, 123; the essentials of a Sacrament, 123;

Sacraments—*Continued.*
matter and form, 124; minister, 124; intention of the minister, 124; subject, 125; dispositions for their efficacy, 125; classification of Sacraments: of the living and of the dead, 125; those which impress character and those which do not, 126; those which are generally necessary, 127, and those which are not, 128; Sacramentals distinguished from Sacraments, 128; sanctifying grace given by all Sacraments in common, 129; Sacramental grace, or "grace of the Sacrament," 129; a Sacrament can only be ministered to a subject, 169.

Sacrifice, universality of the idea, 69; the idea twofold: love the essential idea, 69; sin and penitence a secondary element, 70; twofold conception of the effects of sacrifice: as reconciling GOD and man, 70; as removing guilt and its punishment, 70; sacrifice among the heathen, 234; among the Jews, 234; developed by law, ritual, type, and prophecy, 235; prefigured the Sacrifice of CHRIST in its details, 235; all the sacrifices of the old world point onward to the Cross, 235; definition of sacrifice, 236; examined, 236; immaterial offerings not properly sacrifices, 236; is destruction to the victim essential? 237.

Sacrifice of CHRIST on the Cross, the reconciliation of Mercy and Truth, 73; offered to the Holy Trinity, but especially to GOD the FATHER, 82; includes all good works wrought in CHRIST, 82; numbers among its benefits the Sacraments, 83, and CHRIST'S Merits, 83; prefigured by the Jewish sacrifices, 235; pointed to by all the sacrifices of the old world, 235, and perpetuated by the Eucharist, 236; relation to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 240; mystical identity, 241; differences in mode between the two, 241, 242; the Sacrifice of the Cross contained the merits of all Eucharists, 242.

Sacrifice of the Eucharist: history of the idea of Sacrifice, 69, 70, 234; among the heathen, 234; among the Jews, 234; sacrificial idea developed by law, ritual, type, and prophecy, 235; our LORD'S sacrificial work in its details prefigured, 235; all sacrifices of the old world point onward to the Cross, 235; the Eucharistic Sacrifice perpetuates the Cross, 236; definition of Sacrifice, 236; definition examined, 236; immaterial offerings not properly Sacrifices, 236; is destruction of the victim essential? 237; the Eucharistic Sacrifice: in what it consists, 237; the Eucharistic Sacrifice compared with the definition, 237; four sacrificial actions in the Eucharist, 238; the essential act in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 238; other views, 238; two explanations, 239; the Eucharistic Sacrifice in relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, 240; Eucharist not a repetition of Calvary, 240;

Sacrifice of the Eucharist—*Continued.*
but mystically identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross, 241; the identity is found in the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 241; differences in mode between the two, 241; the Presence visible and mystical, 241; the Priest immediate and mediate, 241; the Sacrifice bloody and unbloody, 241; general and individual, 242; for the human race and for the Church, 242; the Sacrifice of the Cross contained the merits of all Eucharists, 242; the Eucharist a relative Sacrifice, 242; its relation to our LORD'S Mediation, 242; the Oblation in Heaven, 243; the peculiarity of the sacrifice of the Day of Atonement, 243; in what way the Eucharistic Sacrifice is offered by the faithful, 243; they assist in the offering of the Priest, 243; three fruits of the Sacrifice: the general fruit, 244; the special fruit, 244; the most special fruit, 244; the four ends of Sacrifice: praise, 244; thanksgiving, 245; neglect of thanksgiving the great obstacle to spiritual progress, 245; the ingratitude of coming only to communicate, 246; propitiation, 246; impetration, 246; the merits of the two Sacrifices not the same, 247; the grace works "ex opere operato," 247; but in impetration also "ex opere operantis," 247; cases of interrupted Masses, 247; private Masses, 248; solitary Masses forbidden, 248.

Sadducees, their view of GOD, 72.

S. Augustine on Fasting Communion, 263.

S. Bernard, on the intellectual character of Adam's temptation, 38; preaching the Second Crusade—its parallel in Confirmation, 300.

S. Chrysostom quoted in reference to the Eastern view of form in the Eucharist, 210.

S. Clement, his Epistle to the Corinthians, containing liturgical passages, 270.

S. John Baptist as an illustration of the state of the unbaptized, 136.

S. John Damascene, on the Will of GOD, 8; his definition of Angels, 25; definition of the theandric acts of CHRIST, 59.

S. Paul, his statement of the necessity of Baptism, 134; his writings contain traces of a Liturgy, 271.

S. Proclus, quotation illustrating the "Communicatio Idiomatum," 63.

S. Thomas Aquinas, his question, "Quid est Deus?" 1; view of the purpose of the Incarnation, 47; of the future of unbaptized infants, 135; his definition of substance, 226; on the twelve fruits of Communion, 253; his vision, and answer to our LORD'S question, 310.

S. Vincent of Lerins, his rule of doctrine, 93; the teachings of the sects tested by it, 93; the Church's code of morals tested by it, 97.

Sanctifying grace, possessed by man before the Fall, 40; how conferred, 129; conveyed in Penance, 165; hindered by venial sin, 180.

Satisfaction, 165; of CHRIST applied in Penance, 197; in Baptism, 197; how used of man, 198; elements, 200.
Science blind to a Fall, 44.
Scotist view of the purpose of the Incarnation, 47; examined, 48.
Scriptural authority of the Church, 88.
Scripture, Holy, our chief guide to a comprehension of the doctrine of the Atonement, 66; not the first "fons" of doctrine, 106; Protestant view of it false in fact, 107; first a witness to the Church's doctrines, afterwards a "fons," 107; from the Council of Carthage, a source of doctrine, 108; result of the Protestant view of it, 108; witnesses to the Catholic Faith, the Revelation of CHRIST, 113.
Seal of Confession, 195.
Second grace, the, 119.
Sectarian ministry, 86; sectarian teaching tested by the Vincentian Rule, 93
Self-examination, necessary to a knowledge of our state and a good Confession, 173; four difficulties in the way of a good self-examination: familiarity with sin, 184; false views of it, 184; self-deception, 185; the deceits of the devil, 185; the remedy for these difficulties the help of the HOLY GHOST, 185; exemplified in the Parable of the Lost Piece of Silver, 185; method of self-examination, 185; divisions of life, 186; questions on the Commandments and Deadly Sins, 186; the result to be written out, 186; prayer for aid, 186.
Seraphim, 27.
Seven deadly sins, remedied by the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 158.
Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST — *see under* "Gifts."
Sign of the Cross, 280.
Simplicity of GOD, 5.
Sin, of Lucifer,—three views, 30; of Adam,—its intellectual character, 38, 39; its consequences, 39; its chief result, discord in human nature, 40; original sin,—its nature, 43; explained by heredity, 44; meaning and result of sin, 50; twofold conception of its effects, 67; deliverance of man from it in the Atonement, 80; sin remitted in Baptism, 140; sin after Baptism requires a Sacrament, 160; mortal sin destroys grace, 160; renders merit impossible, 166; involves guilt and punishment, 167, 199; the question of salvation necessitates self-examination and a knowledge of sin, 173; nature and malice of sin, 173; definition, 173; malice of sin against GOD the FATHER, 174, the SON, 174, and the HOLY GHOST, 175; divisions of sin: actual and habitual, 175; formal and material, 176; mortal and venial, 177; mortal sin—its characteristics: weighty matter, 177; consciousness of guilt, 178; consent of the will, 178; venial sin, 178; remitted through prayer, 168, 179; evils of venial sin: diminution of fervour, 180; hindrance to sanctifying grace, 180; preparation of

Sin—*Continued.*
the soul for mortal sin, 180; diversion of the will, 181; grieving of the HOLY GHOST, 181; sins of omission and commission, 181; sins of commission, 181; of omission—their number and extent, 181, and their greatness in the sight of GOD, 182; sins of thought, word, and deed, 182; sins of thought, 182; when evil thoughts become sins, 183; sins of word, 183; of deed, 183; our familiarity with sin, 184; the world's false view of sins, 184.
Six Days of creation, no authoritative theory of, 24.
SON of GOD—*see* GOD the SON.
Soul of man, substance, 35; immortality, 35; origin, 36.
Spiration of the HOLY SPIRIT, one, 14.
SPIRIT, HOLY—*see* GOD the HOLY GHOST.
Spirit of GOD, 7.
Spiritual things created, 25.
State of grace, 133.
State of nature, was man created in? 36; difference between it and the state of grace, 133; man's possibilities in a state of nature, 134.
Stoics, their view of GOD, 72.
Stole, 278.
Strength of soul given by the Eucharist, 212, 255.
Structure of prayer, 295.
Struggle, moral, 41; traced to opposite causes, 42; can be accounted for only by a Fall, 44.
Subject of a Sacrament, 125; of Baptism, 140; of Confirmation, 147; of Penance, 164; of the Eucharist, 211.
Succession, Apostolic, 86.
Suffering, a result of sin, 49; no part of the original purpose of the Incarnation, 49; vicarious suffering of CHRIST, 77; endured willingly, 78.
Sufficient grace, 120.
Supernatural state, man in the, 36; "supernatural" explained, 41; supernatural grace lost to man by the Fall, 43.
Suppliant, the, in prayer, 286, 292.

T.

Tabor, illustrating the joy of prayer, 295.
Teaching of the Church—*see* Doctrine.
Temptation, in Adam's case an appeal to curiosity, 37; the three stages of, 37; a type of all temptations, 38; temptation analyzed, 38; appealed to the intellect of Adam, 38; three steps in yielding to temptation, 39; temptation even now chiefly undisciplined desire of the intellect, 39.
Thanksgiving one end of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 245; neglect of, the great obstacle to spiritual progress, 245; thanksgiving after Communion, 268.
Theandric acts of CHRIST, 59; defined by S. John Damascene, 59.
Theological virtues, the, 149; relation to them of the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 150.
Thomist view of the purpose of the Incarnation, 47.
Thought, sins of, 182.
Thrones, 28.

Tobit, material manifestation of the Angel to, 224.
Total depravity of man an exaggeration, 39.
Tradition, definition, 103; illustrated from man's physical nature, 104; Tradition and the Unction of the HOLY GHOST, 105; Tradition perpetuates the Catholic Faith, the Revelation of CHRIST, 112.
Traducianism, 36.
Tree of Life, 51; of Knowledge, 51.
Transubstantiation, inaccurately taught, 220; accepted by the Eastern Church, 227; Roman opinions as to the "accidents"—Algerus, 228; transubstantiation a metaphysical theory, 228.
Trial of the Angels, 30; three views of, 30, 31; trial of Adam, 36, 37.
Trichotomy, 34.
Trinity, the, 12; definition, 13; one Essence, 13; two Processions, 13; Procession of the SON—Eternal Generation, 13; Procession of the HOLY SPIRIT—one Spiration, 14; three Persons, 15; four Relations, 16; five Notions, 16; Perichoresis, 17; errors of Sabellianism and Tritheism, 17; the five views of GOD: Pantheism, 18; Polytheism, 18; Dualism, 19; Monotheism, 19; Christianity, 20.
Tritheism, 17.
Truth, an Attribute of GOD, 9; Truth and Mercy of GOD in relation to sin, 71, set forth in Holy Scripture, 71, and found outside Revelation, 72; set forth by Stoics and Epicureans, Pharisees and Sadducees, Calvinists and Universalists, 72; Truth and Mercy reconciled by the Cross, 73; illustrated by the story of Zaleucus, 73; the Church the teacher of truth, 88; man's thirst for it, 89; spheres of truth: scientific, 89; metaphysical, 90; leads to theology, 90; the Church's sphere of truth, 92; necessary truth, 92; speculative truth, 92; "what is truth?" answered by the doctrines of the Church, 110; whither seekers after it are led, 111; truth taught by Judaism, 114.

U.

Uncreated grace, 118.
Understanding, the Gift of the HOLY GHOST, 154; gives a knowledge of GOD in His Perfections, 154, Ways, 154, Word, 154, Religion, 154, and Providence, 154; produces the dogmatic theologians, 157,
Union with GOD, given in Redemption, 80; conferred in Baptism, 141; made closer by the Eucharist, 212, 252.
Unity of GOD, 5.
Universalists, their view of GOD, 72.
Use of means by GOD, 22.
Uzzah, an example of the importance of a law of worship, 101.

V.

Valentinian II., an illustration of the Baptism of Desire, 132.
Venial sin, 178; remitted through prayer, 168, 179; its evil effects, 179.

Vestments, 278.
Viaticum, the only exception to the rule of Fasting Communion, 266.
Vicarious suffering of CHRIST, 77; vicarious suffering found in human experience, 78.
Vincentian Rule of doctrine, 93; sectarian teaching tested by, 93; the Church's code of morals tested by, 97.
Virgin Birth of GOD the SON, 54.
Virtues, natural or cardinal, 149; theological, 149; the action of the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 149; penance as a virtue, 160.
Virtues (the Angelic Choir), 28.
Vision of GOD, the Holy Angels admitted to, 31; of S. Thomas Aquinas, 310.
Vocal prayer, 297.

W.

Ways of GOD, 154.
Weapons of the Christian, the Seven Gifts of the HOLY GHOST, 158.
"What is truth?" answered by the doctrines of the Church, 110.
Whirlwind, an illustration of the body, 224.
Will of GOD, 8; and Love, the motive of Creation, 24; Antecedent Will in Creation, 49; Consequent Will providing the remedy for the Fall, 50; the Will of GOD the ultimate purpose of prayer, 288.
Will of man, conflict with first motions, 41; not two, 41; grace of the will, 119; the will acted upon by Communion, 252.
Willingness of CHRIST to suffer, 78.
Wisdom, of GOD, 9; the Gift of the HOLY GHOST, 155; gives sweetness, 155, and intuition, 155; produces the ascetic theologians, 157.
Word, of GOD, 154; sins of word, 183.
World, the, created in time, 23; found its climax in man, 49; was to be taken into GOD by the Incarnation, 49.
Worship, the Church the director of, 100; importance of a law of, 100; fallacious theory refuted—positively by the examples of Korah and Uzzah, 101, and negatively by our LORD, 101; the Church's ritual symbolical, 102.
Wrath of GOD, difficulty in the phrase, 68.

Y.

York Minster, illustrating the antiquity of the Liturgy, 269.

Z.

Zaleucus, an illustration of the Mercy and Truth of GOD, 73.
Zwinglianism and the Real Presence, 220.

Works by the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D. D.

RECTOR OF ST. MARK'S, PHILADELPHIA

The Creeds. An Historical and Doctrinal Exposition of the Apostles: Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. Crown 8vo. Pp. xx-321 . . . . (*Postage Extra*) *Net* $1.60

The Eucharistic Sacrifice. With Introduction by Canon Carter. Crown 8vo. Pp. lxix-605 . . . . $3.00

Catholic Faith and Practice: A Manual of Theology. In two parts. Crown 8vo. Part I, pp. xlvi-340 . $2.00
Part II, pp. lxix-519 . . . . . $2.50

Meditations on the Passion of Our Most Holy Redeemer. Comprising Each Scene from the Washing of the Disciples' Feet to the Death upon the Cross. Crown 8vo. (*By mail* 96 cents) . . . . . *Net* 90 cents

The Seven Last Words of Our Most Holy Redeemer, with Meditations on some Scenes in His Passion. Crown 8vo. $1.00

Jesus and the Resurrection. Thirty Addresses for Good Friday and Easter. Crown 8vo $1.25

Helps to Meditation: Sketches for Every Day in the Year
Vol. I. Advent to Trinity. 8vo . . . *Net* $2.50
Vol. II. Trinity to Advent. 8vo . . . *Net* $2.50

Sermons in Miniature for Extempore Preachers: Sketches for Every Sunday and Holy Day of the Christian Year. Crown 8vo $1.50

Notes on the Seven Penitential Psalms, Chiefly from Patristic Sources. Small 8vo $1.00

Learn of Jesus Christ to Die: Addresses on the Words of Our Lord from the Cross, taken as Teaching the Way of Preparation for Death. 16mo . . . 60 cents

The Laws of Happiness; or, the Beatitudes as Teaching Our Duty to God, Self, and Our Neighbour. 18mo, 60 cents

The Laws of Penitence: Addresses on the Words of Our Lord from the Cross. 18mo . . . . 45 cents

Stories from Genesis: Sermons for Children. Crown 8vo $1.00

"These sermons will show how a very valuable foundation of Church teaching may be laid in young minds, and how children may be taught to trace the vital connection between faith and morality."—*The Guardian*, London.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO

NEW YORK, LONDON AND BOMBAY

BX
5930
M65
1905
pt. 1
Lil
has
pt. 1

Mortimer, Alfred Garnett, 1848-1924.
Catholic faith and practice; a manual of theology. 5th ed. New York, Longmans Green, 1905.
2v. 20cm.

Includes bibliographies.

1. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.--Doctrinal and controversial works. 2. Anglo-Catholicism. I. Title.

CCSC/ehw